



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114663719>

7

JOURNALS

OF THE

Legislative Assembly

OF THE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

*From the 15th February to 18th April, 1933
Both Days Inclusive*

IN THE TWENTY-THIRD YEAR OF THE REIGN OF OUR
SOVEREIGN LORD, KING GEORGE V.

BEING THE

Fourth Session of the Eighteenth Legislature
of Ontario

SESSION 1933

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

VOL. LXVII



292234 / 33
16. 10.

TORONTO

Printed and Published by Herbert H. Ball, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty
1933

JOURNALS



OF THE

Legislative Assembly

OF THE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

From the 15th February to 15th April 1933
Both Days Inclusive

IN THE TWENTY-THIRD YEAR OF THE REIGN OF OUR
MOST GRACIOUS KING GEORGE V.

BEING THE

Fourth Session of the Eighteenth Legislature
of Ontario

SESSION 1933

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

VOL. LXVII



TORONTO

Printed and Published by James H. and Thomas H. King, at the Queen's Press, Toronto.
1933

22134
10
10

INDEX

To the Sixty-Seventh Volume

Journals of the Legislative Assembly, Ontario

23 GEORGE V, 1933

ABITIBI POWER AND PAPER COMPANY:

Question (No. 78) as to pulpwood limits or concessions held by, with cancellations or defaults and arrears, 102.

ABITIBI POWER DEVELOPMENT:

1. Purchase of, referred to in Speech from Throne, 3.
2. Question (No. 5) as to date and terms on which it was taken over by Government, 67.
3. Question (No. 6) as to whether Tilley, Johnston, Thomson and Parmenter were retained in connection with acquirement, 44.
4. See also *Ontario Power Service Corporation*.

ACHESON, GEORGE B.:

See *Thousand Islands Bridge Company*.

ACTIONS FOR SIMPLE CONTRACT DEBTS:

See *Debts*.

ADOLESCENT SCHOOL ATTENDANCE ACT:

Bill (No. 91) to amend, introduced, 56. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 84.

AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

Question (No. 108) as to activities of, 106.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, THE ONTARIO:

Question (No. 109) as to cost of new Administration Building, 96.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD:

1. Question (No. 1) as to members of, with dates of appointments and remuneration, also number of employees and wage bill, 25.
2. Question (No. 22) as to number and value of chattel and land mortgages held by, at present time, and number and amount executed in 1932, 39.
3. Question (No. 40) as to number and value of loans made by, in 1932, 42.
4. Question (No. 107) as to foreclosures made by, during last two fiscal years, 96.
5. Question (No. 127) as to arrears of payments owing to. Return ordered, 124.

AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY:

Referred to in Speech from Throne, 3.

AGRICULTURAL REPRESENTATIVES:

Question (No. 87) as to conference of, in December of 1932 and apportionment of cost, 83.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION, COMMITTEE ON:

1. Authorized, 6. Appointed, 18.
2. Mr. Hambly and Mr. Nixon added, 21.
3. Mr. Medd added, 32.
4. Report, 197.

AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF:

1. Report for year ending October 31st, 1932, 162. (*Sessional Paper No. 21.*)
2. Report of Statistics Branch for year ending October 31st, 1932, 162. (*Sessional Paper No. 22.*)

AIRD, JOHN, JR.:

Report of Royal Commission *re* a certain payment to, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 34.*)

ALGOMA, CONSTITUENCY OF:

Question (No. 16) as to amount expended by Government on roads in, during 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932, 57.

ALGOMA STEEL CORPORATION:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported, 19. Bill (No. 20) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 20. Reported, 49. Second reading, 58. House in Committee, 62. Third reading, 79. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 71.)

ALGONQUIN PARK:

Question (No. 83) as to timber or pulpwood leases in, 104.

APPRENTICESHIP ACT, THE:

1. Question (No. 125) as to assessments and collections under, 144.
2. Question (No. 137) as to number of apprentices enrolled under, personnel of the Board and staff, remuneration, etc., 145.

ARCHIVES AND PUBLIC RECORDS, DEPARTMENT OF:

Report for 1932, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 30.*)

ART PURPOSES:

Committee to direct expenditures for. Appointed, 13.

ASSESSMENT ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 64) to amend, introduced, 22. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Laws, 27. Incorporated in Bill (No. 158), 164.
2. Bill (No. 75) to amend, introduced, 31. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 47.
3. Bill (No. 76) to amend, introduced, 31. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 47. Not reported, 164.
4. Bill (No. 79) to amend, introduced, 39. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 54. Not reported, 164.
5. Bill (No. 88) to amend, introduced, 44. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 59. Not reported, 164.

ASSESSMENT ACT, THE—*Continued*

6. Bill (No. 93) to amend, introduced, 59. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 90. Incorporated in Bill (No. 158), 164.
7. Bill (No. 98) to amend, introduced, 66. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 115. Not reported, 164.
8. Bill (No. 104) to amend, introduced, 78. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 97. Not reported, 164.
9. Bill (No. 116) to amend, introduced under suspension of Rule 56, 109. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 134. Incorporated in Bill (No. 158), 164.

ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT ACT, 1933, THE:

Bill (No. 158) to amend, introduced, 165. Second reading, 178. House in Committee, 191. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 2.)

ATHLETIC COMMISSION, THE ONTARIO:

Report for year ending October 31st, 1932, 120. (*Sessional Paper No. 16.*)

AUDITOR, THE PROVINCIAL:

Report for last fiscal year, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 27.*)

AUTOMOBILES, TRUCKS AND MOTORCYCLES:

Question (No. 91) as to number owned by Government in 1929 to 1932 inclusive and cost of. Return ordered, 124.

BAIRD, MR.:

Added to Library Committee, 26.

BARBERS, AN ACT RESPECTING HAIRDRESSERS AND:

See *Hairdressers*.

BARRIE PACKING PLANT:

Question (No. 4) as to whether any additional assistance has been asked from and granted by the Government, 26.

BEAUHARNOIS POWER COMPANY:

Return to an Order of the House of March 24th, 1932, for the production of the contract made with, by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario together with a copy of the confirming Order-in-Council and all correspondence, 148. (*Sessional Paper No. 47.*)

BEAUHARNOIS POWER DEVELOPMENT:

Report of Royal Commission *re* certain matters affecting, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 34.*)

BEAUHARNOIS:

See also *Hydro.*

BECKWITH, TOWNSHIP OF:

See *Drummond.*

BEER:

See *Wine and.*

See *Liquor.*

BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT:

Bill (No. 57) to amend, introduced, 13. Second reading, 23. House in Committee and reported progress, 47. House in Committee, 62. Third reading, 114. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 3.)

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES AND DEATHS:

Report *re* Registration of, for year ending December 31st, 1932, 197. (*Sessional Paper No. 13.*)

BLENHEIM, CORPORATION OF:

Question (No. 45) as to cost of building a bridge over Pere Marquette Railway in Blenheim on No. 3 Highway, 52.

BLIND RIVER:

Question (No. 18) as to amount of direct relief expended in, during fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, 33.

BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT, THE:

See *Education.*

BOTANICAL BUILDING:

Question (No. 58) as to cost of, 52.

BOYCE, ARTHUR C.:

See *Thousand Islands Bridge Company*.

BRANDON, E. T. J.:

Question (No. 74) as to salary of, and last increase, 110.

BRANTFORD:

Question (No. 146) as to total sales from liquor store in, and cost of administration. Return ordered, 199.

BRESLAU, VILLAGE OF:

1. Question (No. 29) as to cost of constructing a bridge near, on No. 7 Highway, 52.
2. Reported on by Committee on Public Accounts, 163.
3. Question (No. 90) as to cost of C.N.R. subway on No. 7 Highway near Breslau, 72.

BREWERS' WAREHOUSE LICENSES:

Question (No. 129) as to issuing of, and fees received from. Return ordered, 130.

BRIGHTON TO CAMPBELLFORD HIGHWAY:

See *Highways*.

BRUCE PENINSULA AND MANITOULIN ISLAND:

See *Manitoulin*.

BUDGET COMMITTEE:

1. Referred to in Speech from Throne, 3.
2. Question (No. 8) as to composition of, and remuneration paid to each member, 22.

BULK SALES ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 126) to amend, introduced, 119. Second reading, 125. House in Committee, 134. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 4.)

BURT, MR.:

Seconds address in reply to Speech from Throne, 8.

CANADIAN ANNUAL REVIEW:

Supply ordered for Members of Legislature, 118.

CANADIAN GENERAL INVESTMENTS, LIMITED:

Question (No. 71) as to whether Right Hon. Arthur Meighen is president of, and whether the company held any bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, 140.

CANADIAN PACKERS:

Question (No. 87) as to whether representatives of, attended a conference of Agricultural Representatives in December, 1932, and what contribution they made to cost of same, 83.

CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARY GUIDE:

Supply ordered for Members of Legislature, 118.

CANADIAN TRANSIT COMPANY:

Petition for an Act respecting, 15. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 17) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Reported, 99. Second reading, 107. House in Committee, 112. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 72.)

CANCER COMMISSION:

Recommendation *re* development of radium referred to in Speech from the Throne, 4.

CEMETERY ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 113) to amend, introduced, 109. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 133. Reported, 164. House in Committee, 187. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 5.)

CEMETERY COMMISSIONS:

Question (No. 136) as to how many have been set up, names of chairmen, fees and expenses paid to, etc., 129.

CENTRAL CANADA EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 28. Bill (No. 5) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported, 65. Second reading, 73. House in Committee, 86. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 73.)

CHARITABLE USES ACT, THE MORTMAIN AND:

See *Mortmain*.

CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT, BILLS OF SALE AND:

See *Bills of Sale*.

CHAUVIN, EDWARD:

Question (No. 70) as to whether he has been appointed to a Government position and if so, at what salary, 140.

CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT, THE DESERTED WIVES' AND:

Bill (No. 59) to amend, introduced, 15. Second reading, 23. House in Committee, 42. Third reading, 114. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 11.)

CIVIL SERVANTS:

Question (No. 126) as to number over age of 65 and how many are receiving War Pensions, 129.

CIVIL SERVICE:

Question (No. 33) as to number of in inside and outside services during 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932, 68.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 142) to amend, introduced, 149. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 188. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 52.)

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER OF ONTARIO:

Report of, for year ending October 31st, 1932, 162. (*Sessional Paper No. 51*.)

CINEMATOGRAPHS ACT:

See *Theatres*.

CLARKSON, GORDON, DILWORTH, GUILFOYLE AND NASH:

Question (No. 7) as to amount paid to the firm or any member thereof by the Government, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission or any other outside public service department during the last three years. Return ordered, 130.

COATSWORTH, EMERSON:

Question (No. 46) as to whether he offered his resignation as Police Commissioner or Senior Police Magistrate during 1932, 140.

COBOCONK-DORSET ROAD:

Question (No. 120) as to expenditure on and amount contributed by Federal Government, 128.

CODE, HAROLD MACKINLAY:

See *Thousand Islands Bridge Company*.

COLLECTION AGENCIES, ACT RESPECTING:

Bill (No. 60) introduced, 15. Second reading, 23. House in Committee, and reported progress, 47. House in Committee, 63. Referred back to Committee, amended and reported, 135. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 6.)

COLONIZATION AND IMMIGRATION, DEPARTMENT OF:

Question (No. 42) as to number of employees of, in Ontario and England or elsewhere and cost of, during last three fiscal years, 94.

COLONIZATION ROADS ACT, THE:

Report of operations under, during year ending October 31st, 1932, 98.
(*Sessional Paper No. 44.*)

COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLES, ACT RESPECTING OPERATION OF:

Bill (No. 155) introduced, 165. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 214.

COMMERCIAL VEHICLE ACT, THE PUBLIC:

See *Vehicle*.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE:

Mr. Mahony elected as Chairman, 32.

COMMITTEE, SELECT, ON PRIVILEGE:

1. Appointed to consider statement made by Gordon Waldron, K.C., respecting a Member of the House, 93.
2. Report, 176.

COMMITTEES:

1. Standing Committees authorized, 6.
2. Striking Committee appointed, 9.
3. Committee on Standing Orders appointed, 12.
4. Committee to assist in management of Library appointed, 13.
5. Committee for Art Purposes appointed, 13.
6. Committee on Privileges and Elections appointed, 16.
7. Committee on Railways appointed, 16.
8. Committee on Private Bills appointed, 17.
9. Committee on Public Accounts appointed, 17.
10. Committee on Printing appointed, 17.
11. Committee on Municipal Law appointed, 17.
12. Committee on Legal Bills appointed, 18.
13. Committee on Agriculture and Colonization appointed, 18.
14. Committee on Fish and Game appointed, 18.
15. Committee on Labour appointed, 18.

(For Reports see under name of committee.)

COMMITTEES, SELECT:

1. (a) Select Committee to consider means of improving method of preparing Voters' Lists, appointed, 26.
(b) Mr. Elliott (Bruce North) added, 66.
(c) Granted permission to sit concurrently with House, 164.
(d) Report, 174.
2. (a) Select Committee to consider Bill (No. 125), An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly, appointed, 119.
(b) Name of Mr. Lyons added, 127.
(c) Report, 178.

COMMITTEES, SELECT—*Continued*

3. Select Committee appointed to consider, during recess, amendments to The Jurors' Act, 139.
4. Select Committee appointed to consider, during recess, the question of amending The Division Courts Act and The Judicature Act, 174.
5. Select Committee appointed to consider, during recess, the question of amending The Medical Act and endeavouring to promote co-operative efforts by the Ontario Medical Association and the Osteopathic practitioners in Ontario, 174.
6. Select Committee appointed to consider a question of privilege, 93. Report, 176.

COMPANIES ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 148) to amend, introduced, 154. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 189. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 7.)
2. Report of Secretary and Registrar *re* administration of, for year ending October 31st, 1932, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 50.*)

COMPANIES INFORMATION ACT, THE:

Report of the Secretary and Registrar respecting the Administration of, for the year ending October 31st, 1932, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 50.*)

CONDITIONAL SALES ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 114) to amend, introduced, 109. Second reading, 115. House in Committee, 126. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 8.)

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND:

1. Motion for raising sum of \$40,000,000 on credit of. Ordered, 16.
2. Act for raising money on the Credit of. Bill (No. 160) introduced, 166. Resolution introduced, Lieutenant-Governor's approval signified, passed through House and referred to Bill, 185. Second reading, 187. House in Committee, 200. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 45.)

CONSUMPTIVES, SANATORIA FOR:

See *Sanatoria*.

CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 143) to amend, introduced, 149. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 171. Third reading, 179. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 9.)

CORNWALL, TOWN OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 18) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Reported, 65. Second reading, 73. House in Committee, 86. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 74.)

CORNWALL, TOWN OF, AND POWDRELL AND ALEXANDER COMPANY:

Petition for an Act respecting, 32. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 49. Bill (No. 44) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 51. Reported, 91. Second reading, 98. House in Committee, 107. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 74.)

CORPORATIONS ACT, THE EXTRA PROVINCIAL:

Report of the Secretary and Registrar respecting the administration of, for year ending October 31st, 1932, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 50.*)

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT, THE:

1. Motion for amendment to, 131.
2. Bill (No. 118) to amend, introduced, 113. Resolution introduced, Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified, passed through House and referred to Bill, 131. Second reading, 134. House in Committee, 151. Third reading, 172. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 10.)

CRIMINAL INSANE HOSPITAL AT PENETANGUISHENE:

See *Penetanguishene*.

CROWLAND, TOWNSHIP OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 24. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 64. Bill (No. 46) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 66. Reported, 91. Second reading, 98. House in Committee, 107. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 75.)

CROWN COUNSEL:

Question (No. 24) as to amount paid to special counsel during last fiscal year, 33.

CROWN LANDS OFFICES:

Question (No. 133) as to offices closed since November 1st, 1931, 167.

CURRENT EXPENDITURE ON HIGHWAYS:

Question (No. 81) as where comparison of, to Current Revenue for Highways Purposes, is shown in Public Accounts, 72.

DAVIDSON, A. E.:

Question (No. 74) as to present salary and last salary increase, 110.

DEATHS:

See *Births, etc.*

DEBATES:

1. On Address-in-Reply to Speech from the Throne, 8, 20, 21, 24, 31, 37, 51, 55, 66, 75.
2. On motion to go into Supply, 100, 113, 117, 119, 120, 135, 152, 153,
3. On Second reading of Bill (No. 137), 175.

DEBTS,—ACT TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR THE COMMENCEMENT OF ACTIONS FOR SIMPLE CONTRACT DEBTS:

Bill (No. 111) introduced, 87. Second reading and referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 97. Not reported, 139.

. DESERTED WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT, THE:

See *Children.*

DETROIT INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE COMPANY:

See *Canadian Transit Company.*

DISCRIMINATING MATTER, ACT RESPECTING PUBLICATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF:

Bill (No. 71) introduced, 25. Second reading and referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 63. Not reported, 173.

DIVISION COURTS ACT:

1. Bill (No. 127) to amend, introduced, 119. Second reading and referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 134. Not reported, 173.
2. Select Committee appointed to consider amendments to, 174.

DIVISIONS IN THE HOUSE:

1. On debate on address in reply to Speech from Throne, 75-76-77.
2. On Second reading of Bill (No. 73), 54.
3. On Second reading of Bill (No. 101), 116.
4. On motion to go into Supply, 136, 137, 152.
5. On Second reading of Bill (No. 121), 146.
6. On Second reading of Bill (No. 137), 175.
7. On Second reading of Bill (No. 156), 214.

DOBSON, W. P.:

Question (No. 74) as to present salary and last salary increase, 110.

DON CARLOS, H. C.:

Question (No. 74) as to present salary and last increase of salary, 110.

DON VALLEY, ACT TO CONSERVE AND IMPROVE:

Bill (No. 61) introduced, 15. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 23. Reported, 164. House in Committee, 187. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 12.)

DRAINAGE ACT, THE MUNICIPAL:

Bill (No. 141) to amend, introduced, 149. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 188. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 38.)

DRAINAGE ACT, THE PROVINCIAL AID TO:

Bill (No. 140) to amend, introduced, 149. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 188. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 48.)

DRUMMOND, NORTH ELSLEY, BECKWITH AND MONTAGUE, TOWNSHIPS OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported, 19. Bill (No. 10) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 20. Withdrawn, 149.

DRUNKENNESS AND DRUNKEN DRIVING:

Question (No. 104) as to number accused of, 1926 to 1932, 105.

DYFART TOWNSHIP:

Question (No. 116) as to contribution made by, towards cost of Haliburton-Eagle Lake Road, 127.

EAST BLOCK:

1. Question (No. 36) as to cost of addition to, 36.
2. Question (No. 57) as to cost of furnishing, 46.
3. Question (No. 149) as to tenders for plastering addition to, and cost of, 199.

EAST YORK, TOWNSHIP OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 29. Bill (No. 24) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported, 91. Second reading, 98. House in Committee, 107. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 76.)

ECKFORD, WARD:

Question (No. 130) as to payments made to, by Highways Department, 159.

EDUCATION ACT, BOARDS OF:

Bill (No. 63) to amend, introduced, 22. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 54. Reported, 164. House in Committee, 187. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 58.)

EDUCATION:

1. Public School Act, The:

Bill (No. 90) to amend, introduced, 56. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 84.

2. Adolescent School Act, The:

Bill (No. 91) to amend, introduced, 56. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 84.

3. High Schools Act, The:

Bill (No. 92) to amend, introduced, 56. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 85.

4. School Law Amendment Act, The:

Bill (No. 124) to amend, introduced, 114. Second reading, 146. House in Committee, 151. Referred back to Committee, amended and reported, 216. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 58.)

EDUCATION—*Continued*

5. Statement of Legislative Grants apportioned to Rural, Public and Separate Schools in the Counties and Districts for the year 1932, 32. (*Sessional Paper No. 37.*)

EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF:

Report for year 1932, 179. (*Sessional Paper No. 11.*)

EDUCATION ACT, DEPARTMENT OF:

Return of regulations and Orders-in-Council made under, or of the Acts relating to Public, Separate or High Schools, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 31.*)

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM:

Lightening of taxation for, forecast in Speech from Throne, 4.

EFFICIENCY EXPERTS:

Question (No. 35) as to whether they are working in any of the Government Departments, 60.

ELECTION ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 66) to amend, introduced, 22. Second reading and referred to Select Committee appointed to consider best means of improving the method of preparing Provincial Voters' Lists, 90. Not reported, 174.
2. Bill (No. 163) to amend, introduced, 174. Second reading, 186. House in Committee, 199. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent 225. (23, George V, c. 13.)

ELECTIONS:

Report of by-election in York, West, laid on the Table, 5. (*Sessional Paper No. 25.*)

ELECTIONS, PROVINCIAL:

1. Select Committee appointed to consider best means of improving method of preparing Voters' Lists for, 26.
2. Mr. Elliott (Bruce North) added, 66.
3. Granted permission to sit concurrently with House, 164.
4. Report, 174.

ELLIOTT, MR. (BRUCE NORTH):

Added to Select Committee appointed to consider the improvement of method of preparing Provincial Voters' Lists, 66.

ELMSLEY, NORTH, TOWNSHIP OF:

See *Drummond*.

EPILEPTICS:

See *Hospitals*.

ESPANOLA:

Question (No. 18) as to amount of money spent in, by way of direct relief during the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, and what portion was contributed by the Government, 33.

ESPANOLA TO MCKERROW:

Question (No. 13) as to length of road between, and amount expended on during 1931 and 1932, 56.

ESPANOLA-LITTLE CURRENT HIGHWAY:

Question (No. 14) as to purchase of gravel for and cost of, 57.

ESSEX BORDER UTILITIES COMMISSION:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 29. Bill (No. 14) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported, 148. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 172. Third reading, 180. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 77.)

ESTIMATES:

1. Supplementary Estimates for 1933 presented, 99.
2. Main Estimates for 1934, presented, 165. (*Sessional Paper No. 2*.)

EXCHANGE RATE, ADVERSE:

Question (No. 9) as to cost of, to the Government and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission during last three fiscal years, 79.

EXECUTION ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 58) to amend, introduced, 13. Second reading, 26. House in Committee, 42. Third reading, 78. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 14.)

FACTORY, SHOP AND OFFICE BUILDING ACT:

Bill (No. 105) to amend, introduced, 104. Second reading, 92. House in Committee, 107. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 15.)

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT:

1. Conference of Provinces with, mentioned in Speech from Throne, 2.
2. Question (No. 116) as to contribution by, towards Haliburton-Eagle Lake Road, 127.
3. Question (No. 120) as to contribution by, to cost of Coboconk-Dorset Road, 128.

FEEBLE MINDED:

See *Hospitals*.

FERGUSON HIGHWAY:

Question (No. 119) as to amount of relief expenditures on, 128.

FERGUSON, RIGHT HONOURABLE G. HOWARD:

Question (No. 10) as to cost of painting his portrait, 33.

FERRANTI ELECTRIC, LIMITED:

Petition for an Act respecting, 16. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 49. Bill (No. 43) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Withdrawn, 149.

FIFE, A.:

Question (No. 130) as to payments to, by Highways Department, 159.

FIRE MARSHALS ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 81) to amend, introduced, 43. Second reading, 58. House in Committee, 63. Third reading, 114. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 16.)

FISH AND GAME, COMMITTEE ON:

1. Authorized, 6. Appointed, 18.
2. Given permission to sit concurrently with House, 67.
3. Report, 198.

FISH, MR.:

Question (No. 131) as to payments to, by Highways Department, 159.

FOREST FIRES PREVENTION ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 145) to amend, introduced, 150. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 189. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 17.)

FOREST HILL, VILLAGE OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 22) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Reported, 74. Second reading, 85. House in Committee, 87. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 79.)

FOREST RESERVES, CROWN:

Question (No. 75) as to number created under The Forestry Act, when created and area, 82.

FORESTRY ACT, THE:

1. Question (No. 76) as to leases, purchases or expropriations made under, and townships and settlers affected, 166.
2. Question (No. 82) as to amount of Crown lands, timber or pulpwood, which has been cancelled or surrendered under the Act, 83.

FORESTRY BOARD:

Question (No. 77) as to members of, and cost, 82.

FRUIT, ACT RESPECTING SALE AND INSPECTION OF:

Bill (No. 139) introduced, 149. Second reading, 169. House in Committee, 190. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 18.)

GABY, F. A.:

Question (No. 43) as to present salary and last increase, 109.

GAME AND FISH, COMMITTEE ON:

See *Fish*.

GAME AND FISH, SELECT COMMITTEE ON:

1. Report of Committee's proceeding, 1931 to 1933, 59. (*Sessional Paper No. 32.*)
2. Minutes of meetings, February and March, 1933, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 49.*)
3. Question (No. 68) as to cost of, to date, 122.

GAME AND FISHERIES ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 154) to amend, introduced, 165. Second reading, 178. House in Committee, 191. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 19.)

GAME AND FISHERIES, DEPARTMENT OF:

Report for 1932, 173. (*Sessional Paper No. 9.*)

GARAGE, GOVERNMENT:

Question (No. 88) as to cost of, 1929 to 1932, inclusive, and as to purchases of autos, trucks or motorcycles during same years, 139.

GASOLINE:

Question (No. 32) as to amount sold during 1931 and 1932, 41.

GASOLINE TAX:

1. Question (No. 30) as to amount of arrears amongst retail vendors of gasoline, 44.
2. Question (No. 32) as to amount collected during years 1931 and 1932 and cost of collecting, 41.
3. Question (No. 39) as to amount and number of refunds from, after six months' limit of application for such refund has expired, 60.

GATINEAU POWER:

See *Hydro*.

GLENGARRY, COUNTY OF:

Question (No. 124) as to miles of rural hydro lines and number of farm contracts in, 158.

GLOBES OF THE WORLD, GEOGRAPHICAL:

Supply ordered for Members of Legislature, 118.

GOLD MINING:

Prospects of, referred to in Speech from Throne, 3.

GOLD STANDARD:

Departure of Great Britain from, mentioned in Speech from Throne, 3.

GOVERNMENT, THE:

1. Question (No. 6) as to whether it retained the services of Tilley, Johnston, Thomson and Parmenter, in connection with the acquirement of the Abitibi Power Development, 44.
2. Question (No. 7) as to amounts paid by, to Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle and Nash during the last three years. Return ordered, 130.
3. Question (No. 9) as to cost of adverse exchange rate to, during last three fiscal years, 79.
4. Question (No. 19) as to reduction in totals of Revenue and Expenditures during years 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932 by adoption of the new system of bookkeeping by which cross entries are eliminated, 166.
5. Question (No. 28) as to accounts owing by, which were due on October 31st, 1932, 102.
6. Question (No. 35) as to whether efficiency experts are working in any Department, 60.
7. Question (No. 91) as to number of automobiles, trucks and motorcycles owned by, 1929 to 1932, inclusive, and cost of. Return ordered, 124.
8. Question (No. 114) as to whether any member of the Cabinet held bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation at the time of the Abitibi Power purchase, 142.

GOVERNMENT. THE—*Continued*

9. Question (No. 145) as to whether any information can be given regarding ownership of bonds of Ontario Power Service Corporation not turned in on Abitibi deal, 182.

GOVERNMENT BUILDING:

- Question (No. 41) as to cost of erecting and furnishing the Ontario Government Building in London, 42.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS:

- Question (No. 55) as to total investment in, in Toronto, 87.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS:

- To be placed on the Order Paper, on Fridays and Wednesdays, 108.

GOVERNMENT GARAGE:

See *Garage*.

GOVERNMENT MOTOR CARS:

- Question (No. 89) as to how many are reserved for use of Ministers and cost of same, 198.

GRANT, JAMES:

Petition for an Act respecting Township of North Scarborough.

See *Scarborough*.

GREAT LAKES PAPER COMPANY, LIMITED:

- Question (No. 138) as to undeveloped water powers held by, estimated horsepower and revenue from, to the Province, 168.

GUNNING, J. R.:

- Question (No. 130) as to payments to, by Highways Department, 159.

GUNNINGS:

- Question (No. 130) as to number of, paid on Talbotville Division of Highways, 159.

HAIRDRESSERS AND BARBERS, ACT RESPECTING:

Petition for an Act respecting, 16. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 64. Bill (No. 45) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 66. Reported, 149. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 172. Third reading, 180. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 80.)

HALIBURTON-EAGLE LAKE ROAD:

Question (No. 116) as to amount spent on, and how divided, 127.

HALTON, COUNTY OF:

Question (No. 34) as to Clerk of Surrogate Court, 35.

HAMBLY, MR.:

Added to Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, 21.

HAMILTON, CITY OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 28. Bill (No. 2) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 29. Reported, 74. Second reading, 85. House in Committee, 87. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 81.)

HAVERGAL COLLEGE:

Petition for an Act respecting, 12. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 30) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Reported, 74. Second reading, 85. House in Committee, 87. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 82.)

HEALTH ACT, THE PUBLIC:

1. Bill (No. 72) to amend, introduced, 27. Second reading and referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 54. Not reported, 139.
2. Bill (No. 109) to amend, introduced, 86. Second reading, 100. House in Committee, 108. Referred back to Committee, amended and reported, 216. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 50.)

HEALTH, DEPARTMENT OF:

Report for year 1932 presented, 138. (*Sessional Paper No. 14.*)

HENRY, HONOURABLE GEORGE S.:

Question (No. 114) as to whether he owned bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, 142.

HIGH SCHOOLS ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 92) to amend, introduced, 56. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 85.

HIGHWAY DEBT RETIREMENT:

Question (No. 81) as to where it is shown in Public Accounts for 1930-31, 71.

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT FUND:

1. Question (No. 20) as to amount set apart each year since creation of Fund under Sections 7 and 8 of The Highway Improvement Act, 33.
2. Statement showing all sums credited to, and all sums charged against, for the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, 90. (*Sessional Paper No. 42.*)

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 67) to amend, introduced, 22. Second reading and referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 36. Not reported, 138.
2. Bill (No. 77) to amend, introduced, 33. Second reading, 78. House in Committee, 100. Referred back to Committee, amended and reported, 216. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 20.)

HIGHWAYS ACT, PUBLIC SERVICE WORKS ON:

See *Public*.

HIGHWAYS, DEPARTMENT OF:

1. Report for year 1932, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 48.*)
2. Question (No. 13) as to expenditure on road from Espanola to McKerrow in years 1931 and 1932 and total length of road, 56.
3. Question (No. 14) as to purchase of gravel for Espanola-Little Current Highway in 1931 and 1932, 57.
4. Question (No. 15) as to amounts paid for highway rights-of-way across La Cloche Island and to whom were payments made, 57.

HIGHWAYS, DEPARTMENT OF—*Continued*

5. Question (No. 23) as to cost of taking traffic census during last two fiscal years, 34.
6. Question (No. 29) as to cost of constructing a bridge near Breslau on No. 7 Highway, 52.
7. Question (No. 45) as to cost of building a bridge over the Pere Marquette Railway near Blenheim on Highway No. 3, 52.
8. Question (No. 60) as to cost of removing snow from Highway No. 2 last fiscal year and as to whether work is now done by contract, 53.
9. Question (No. 84) as to cost of tree-trimming along King's Highways last fiscal year, 72.
10. Question (No. 85) as to cost of cutting grass or weeds on the King's Highways, last fiscal year, 83.
11. Question (No. 90) as to net cost to Province of building a subway at the C.N.R. tracks near Breslau on No. 7 Highway, 72.
12. Question (No. 92) as to taking over of King's Highway No. 30 from Brighton to Campbellford, and cost to Government, 84.
13. Question (No. 116) as to amount spent on Haliburton-Eagle Lake Road and how expenditure was divided, 127.
14. Question (No. 119) as to amount of expenditures as relief measures on King's Highway, Ferguson Highway and Trans-Canada Highway, 128.
15. Question (No. 120) as to amount of expenditure on Coboconk-Dorset Road, and how much was contributed by the Federal Government, 128.
16. Question (No. 122) as to whether the Department of Highways has issued any special licenses to truckers on behalf of the railways, to whom issued, etc., 180.
17. Question (No. 130) as to payments to certain Gunning's on Talbotville Division of Highway System in County of Elgin, also payments to W. Fife and Ward Eckford, 159.
18. Question (No. 131) as to salaries of certain officials on Talbotville Division, 159.
19. Question (No. 132) as to whether any complaint was received regarding irregularities *re* the Talbotville Division, etc., 129.

HIGHWAYS, DEPARTMENT OF—*Continued*

20. Question (No. 134) as to borrowings for and sinking fund provided for Provincial roads, 124.
21. Question (No. 142) as to amount of money borrowed and charged to capital account for construction of Highways, 181.
22. Question (No. 143) as to amount set aside in Debt Retirement scheme for retirement of Highway debt, 181.
23. Commercial Motor Vehicles, Act respecting Operation of:
Bill (No. 155) introduced, 165. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 214.
24. Public Commercial Vehicle Act:
Bill (No. 151) to amend, introduced, 155. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 190. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 49.)
25. Public Vehicle Act, The:
Bill (No. 150) to amend, introduced, 155. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 189. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 53.)

HISTORICAL SOCIETY, THE ONTARIO:

See *Ontario*.

HOGARTH, GEORGE:

Examined by Committee on Public Accounts, 164.

HOGG, DR. J. H.:

Question (No. 74) as to his salary and last increase, 110.

HOSPITALS ACT, THE PUBLIC:

Bill (No. 122) to amend, introduced, 114. Second reading, 134. House in Committee, 151. Third reading, 172. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 51.)

HOSPITALS AND SANATORIA:

Report on, for year ending September 30th, 1932, 162. (*Sessional Paper No. 17.*)

HOSPITALS FOR MENTALLY ILL, FEEBLE MINDED, EPILEPTICS, ETC.:

Report for year ending October 31st, 1932, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 15*).

HOUSE, THE:

1. Proclamation calling, 1.
2. House meets, 2.
3. Sits after midnight, 120, 194.
4. Motion to sit at 11.00 o'clock a.m., 179.
5. Adjourns over several days for prorogation, 219.
6. Prorogues, 227.

HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER COMMISSION OF ONTARIO:

1. Reserves (financial) of, referred to in Speech from Throne, 3.
2. Report for year ending October 31st, 1932, 197. (*Sessional Paper No. 26*.)
3. Report of Royal Commission to inquire into certain matters, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 34*.)
4. Manitoulin Rural Power District Act, The:

Bill (No. 152) introduced, 155. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 190. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 28.)

5. Ontario Power Service Corporation:

Bill (No. 137) respecting the acquisition of the properties of, introduced, 139. Second reading carried on Division, 175. House in Committee, 200. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 1.)

6. Power Commission Act:

Bill (No. 133) to amend, introduced, 139. Second reading, 186. House in Committee, 200. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 47.)

7. Power Commission Act, 1933, The:

Bill (No. 153) introduced, 155. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 190. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 47.)

HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER COMMISSION OF ONTARIO—*Continued*

8. Power Commission Act, The:

Bill (No. 156) to amend, introduced, 165. Second reading, defeated on division, 214.

9. Question (No. 3) as to cost of, and payments to Commissioners and counsel, 25.
10. Question (No. 6) as to whether Commission retained Mr. W. N. Tilley or Tilley, Johnston, Thomson and Parmenter or any member of the firm in connection with the acquirement of the Abitibi Power Development, 44.
11. Question (No. 7) as to amounts paid by, to Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle and Nash during the last three fiscal years, 130.
12. Question (No. 9) as to cost to Hydro of adverse exchange rate during last three fiscal years, 79.
13. Question (No. 27) as to what is the total amount of reserves and how invested, 39.
14. Question (No. 31) as to capital expenditures made by, during years 1928 to 1932 inclusive, 45.
15. Question (No. 43) as to number of permanent and temporary employees during last three fiscal years and salaries and increases of salaries of F. A. Gaby, W. W. Pope and I. B. Lucas, 109.
16. Question (No. 44) as to excess cost of power from the Gatineau for which payment has to be made in United States funds because of adverse exchange rates and also, is all Gatineau and Beauharnois power being distributed, 60.
17. Question (No. 61) as to whether reserve of, includes \$20,000,000.00 equity of the municipalities, 70.
18. Question (No. 64) as to amount of power supplied by, to Sudbury Mining District during 1930, 1931, 1932 and up to February 1st, 1933, 81.
19. Question (No. 74) as to salaries and salary increases of heads of divisions, 110.
20. Question (No. 79) as to what contracts were held by, for delivery of power developed by the Ontario Power Service Corporation prior to the acquisition by the Province of the Abitibi Power Company and what contracts have been made since, 71.

HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER COMMISSION OF ONTARIO—*Continued*

21. Question (No. 93) as to expenditures by, last fiscal year on wages and salaries, operation, maintenance and administration, 123.
22. Question (No. 95) as to debentures of municipalities held by, 88.
23. Question (No. 96) as to cost of constructing and equipping laboratories; and salaries in connection with, 155.
24. Question (No. 97) as to cost and use of short-wave radio stations owned by, 110.
25. Question (No. 98) as to cost of Forestry Division of, last fiscal year, 111.
26. Question (No. 99) as to cost of legal department of, and number of lawyers on staff, 123.
27. Question (No. 100) as to auditors of, and cost of, 158.
28. Question (No. 101) as to revenue from Canada Niagara Power Company, 1931 and 1932, 89.
29. Question (No. 102) as to expenditures by, on Publicity last fiscal year, 95.
30. Question (No. 103) as to cost of and subscribers to the Bulletin during 1932, 95.
31. Question (No. 110) as to loans made under Rural Power District Loans Act, and amount of same, 167.
32. Question (No. 113) as to amount of insurance carried by, and with what companies, 156.
33. Question (No. 114) as to whether chairman or any member of, held bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation at time of Abitibi Power purchase, 142.
34. Question (No. 115) as to whether the Commission has submitted an offer for assets of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, at the judicial sale recently advertised, 142.
35. Question (No. 117) as to amount taken from contingent fund of, beyond the amount used to pay exchange, 155.
36. Question (No. 124) as to number of miles of rural Hydro line in the County of Glengarry and number of farm-service contracts signed, 158.

HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER COMMISSION OF ONTARIO—*Continued*

37. Question (No. 145) as to ownership of, balance of Ontario Power Service Corporation bonds not turned in on Abitibi deal, 182.
38. Question (No. 148) as to how many employees of, are of 65 years of age. Lapsed.
39. Motion for a Return of all agreements, contracts and correspondence regarding the acquisition of the properties of the Ontario Power Service Corporation. Return ordered, 215.
40. Return to an Order of the House of March 24th, 1932, for the production of the contract between the Beauharnois Power Company and the Hydro-Electric Commission together with the Order-in-Council confirming same and all correspondence, 148. (*Sessional Paper No. 47.*)

IMMIGRATION, COLONIZATION AND:

See *Colonization*.

IMPERIAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE:

Referred to in Speech from Throne, 3.

INNKEEPERS ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 99) to amend, introduced, 66. Second reading and referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 90. Reported as amended, 139. House in Committee, 187. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 21.)

INSANE, HOSPITAL FOR CRIMINAL, AT PENETANGUISHENE:

See *Penetanguishene*.

INSPECTORS' SUPERANNUATION FUND:

See *Teachers and*.

INSURANCE ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 134) to amend, introduced, 139. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 171. Third reading, 179. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 22.)

INSURANCE (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) ACT, 1933:

Bill (No. 129) introduced, 120. Second reading, 151. House in Committee, 170. Third reading, 179. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 23.)

INSURANCE, SUPERINTENDENT OF:

Report for year ending December 31st, 1932, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 6.*)

JEFFREY, R. T.:

Question (No. 74) as to present salary and last salary increase, 110.

JENKINS, B. M. & T.:

Supply of furniture by, investigated by Committee on Public Accounts, 164.

JUDICATURE ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 78) to amend, introduced, 37. Second reading and referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 97. Not reported, 173.
2. Select Committee appointed to consider amendments to, during recess, 174.

JURORS ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 68) to amend, introduced, 22. Second reading referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 63. Not reported, 139.
2. Select Committee appointed to consider amendments to, during recess, 139.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE:

Bill respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office to, 6.

KAPUSKASING, ACT OF INCORPORATION OF TOWN OF:

Bill (No. 119) to amend, introduced, 113. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 189. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 24.)

KENORA DISTRICT:

Question (No. 144) as to Superintendent of Child Welfare for, his salary and expenses, etc., 182.

KENORA, TOWN OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 28. Bill (No. 29) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported, 74. Second reading, 85. House in Committee, 87. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 83.)

KENORA, TOWN OF, AND KEEWATIN POWER COMPANY, LIMITED:

Petition for an Act respecting, 38. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 65. Bill (No. 48) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 66. Reported, 99. Second reading, 107. House in Committee, 112. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 84.)

KING'S HIGHWAYS:

1. Expenditure on, referred to in Speech from Throne, 4.
2. Question (No. 37) as to expenditure in surveying for centre highway in Counties of Halton and Peel, 36.
3. Question (No. 52) as to miles of, and cost of, in Prescott County. Withdrawn.
4. Question (No. 53) as to miles of, and cost of, in Russell County. Withdrawn.
5. Question (No. 60) as to cost and manner of snow removal on, 53.
6. Question (No. 84) as to cost of tree-trimming on, last fiscal year, 71.
7. Question (No. 85) as to cost of cutting grass and weeds last fiscal year, 83.
8. Question (No. 92) as to taking over highway from Brighton to Campbellford and cost to Government, 84.
9. Question (No. 119) as to amount of relief expenditures on, 128.

LABOUR, COMMITTEE ON:

Authorized, 6. Appointed, 18.

LABOUR, DEPARTMENT OF:

Report for year 1932, 98. (*Sessional Paper No. 10.*)

LA CLOCHE ISLAND:

Question (No. 15) as to purchase of right-of-way on, for highway purposes, 57.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT, THE RELIEF:

See *Relief*.

LANDS AND FORESTS, DEPARTMENT OF:

Report for year ending October 31st, 1932, 179. (*Sessional Paper No. 3.*)

LAW STAMPS:

Question (No. 150) as to fees or remuneration paid in connection with sale of, during 1930 and 1931. Return ordered, 199.

LEGAL BILLS, COMMITTEE ON:

1. Authorized, 6. Appointed, 18.
2. Mr. Strickland added, 21.
3. Reports presented, 138, 173.

LEGAL OFFICES, INSPECTOR OF:

Report for year ending December 31st, 1932, 98. (*Sessional Paper No. 5.*)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, THE:

1. Proclamation calling, 1.
2. Readjustment of representation in, forecast in Speech from Throne, 4.
3. Sits after midnight, 120, 194.
4. Adjourns to 11.00 a.m., 179.
5. Adjourns over several days, 219.
6. Prorogues, 227.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 101) to amend, introduced, 67. Motion for Second reading defeated on division, 116.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

1. Select Committee appointed to consider representation of the people in, 119.
2. Name of Mr. Lyons added, 127.
3. Report, 178.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, ACT RESPECTING REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE IN:

Bill (No. 125) introduced, 114. Second reading and referred to Select Committee, 119. Reported, 178. House in Committee, 192, 217. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 56.)

LIBRARY, COMMITTEE TO ASSIST MR. SPEAKER IN MANAGEMENT OF:

1. Appointed, 13.
2. Mr. Baird added, 26.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR, THE:

1. Proclamation calling Assembly, 1.
2. His Speech at opening of the House, 2.
3. Presents Public Accounts, 99.
4. Presents Estimates to House, 99, 165.
5. Recommends resolutions to House, 97, 124, 131, 186.
6. Assents to Bills, 225.
7. His Speech at closing, 225.

LIGNITE, NORTHERN ONTARIO:

Report of Ontario Research Foundation *re* investigation of, 148. (*Sessional Paper No. 46.*)

LINDSAY:

Question (No. 118) as to the Local Registrar of the Supreme Court, 143.

LIQUOR CONTROL ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 106) to amend, introduced, 78. Second reading, 107. House in Committee, 112. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 25.)

LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD OF ONTARIO:

1. Report for last fiscal year, 37. (*Sessional Paper No. 20.*)
2. Question (No. 49) as to profits of, for fiscal years ending October 31st, 1931 and 1932, also total sales, number of staff, etc., 69.
3. Question (No. 111) as to sales of liquor, wine and beer during fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, 141.
4. Question (No. 129) as to issuing of Brewers' Warehouse Licenses in certain centres and payment of fees therefor. Return ordered, 130.

LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD OF ONTARIO—*Continued*

5. Question (No. 146) as to firms in Scotland from whom the Board purchased liquor during last fiscal year, and also amount of sales and cost of administration of stores at Woodstock, Brantford and Paris. Return ordered, 199.

LITTLE CURRENT HIGHWAY:

See *Espanola*.

LOAN ACT, THE ONTARIO:

Bill (No. 160) introduced, 166. Resolution introduced, Lieutenant-Governor's recommendation signified, passed through the House and referred to Bill, 185. Second reading, 186. House in Committee, 200. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 45.)

LOAN BILL:

See *Supply*.

LOAN CORPORATIONS, REGISTRAR OF:

Report for year ending December 31st, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 7.*)

LOCAL IMPROVEMENT ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 74) to amend, introduced, 31. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 43. Incorporated in Bill (No. 159), 164.
2. Bill (No. 80) to amend, introduced, 39. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 54. Incorporated in Bill (No. 159), 164.

LOCAL IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENT ACT, 1933, THE:

Bill (No. 159) introduced, 165. Second reading, 178. House in Committee, 191. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 26.)

LOCKHART, GORDON, COLONEL H. D.:

Question (No. 66) as to, payments being made to by Government for work on Budget Committee, 71.

LONDON, CITY OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 26) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Reported, 149. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 172. Third reading, 180. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 85.)

LONDON, ROMAN CATHOLIC EPISCOPAL CORPORATION OF THE DIOCESE OF:

See *Roman*.

LONG POINT PARK ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 70) to amend, introduced, 25. Second reading, 27. House in Committee, 42. Third reading, 79. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 27.)

LOUNGE ROOM, THE MEMBERS':

See *Members*.

LUCAS, I. B.:

Question (No. 43) as to present salary and last increase, 109.

LYONS, MR.:

Name added to Select Committee appointed to consider Bill (No. 125), An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly, 127.

MAHONY, MR.:

Elected Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, 32.

MANITOBA ROAD, ONTARIO AND:

See *Ontario*.

MANITOULIN ISLAND:

1. Question (No. 17) as to expenditures by Government on roads in, during 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932, 57.
2. Question (No. 94) as to construction of a ferry boat to operate between Manitoulin and Bruce Peninsula and cost of same, 88.
3. Question (No. 141) as to whether the Government has purchased a boat to be used as a ferry in connection with, 169.

MANITOULIN RURAL POWER DISTRICT ACT:

Bill (No. 152) introduced, 155. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 190. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 28.)

MARIE, LES REVERENDS PERES OBLATS DE L'IMMACULEE CONCEPTION DE:

Petition for an Act respecting, 12. Reported, 19. Bill (No. 33) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 20. Reported, 49. Fees less penalties and cost of printing, remitted, 49. Second reading, 58. House in Committee, 62. Third reading, 79. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 86.)

MARKETING BOARD, THE ONTARIO:

1. Work of, referred to in Speech from Throne, 3.
2. Question (No. 128) as to exploitations of cheese by, 129.

MARRIAGE ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 53) to amend, introduced, 52. Second reading, 112. House in Committee, 117. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 29.)

MARRIAGES:

See *Births, etc.*

MATTER, DISCRIMINATING:

See *Discriminating.*

MECHANICS' LIEN ACT, THE

1. Bill (No. 56) to amend, introduced, 13. Second reading, 23. House in Committee, 36. Third reading, 114. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 30.)
2. See also *Section 20, Statute Law Amendment Act (No. 147).*

MEDD, MR.:

Name added to Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, 32.

MEDICAL ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 83) to amend, introduced, 43. Second reading, 64. House in Committee, 100. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 31.)
2. Bill (No. 108) to amend, introduced, 86. Second reading and referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 112. Not reported, 173.
3. Select Committee appointed to consider Amendments to, during recess, 174.

MEIGHEN, RIGHT HONOURABLE ARTHUR:

Question (No. 71) as to whether he is connected with Canadian General Investments and whether this company held any bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, 140.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE:

Full Sessional Indemnity to be paid to, 219.

MEMBERS' LOUNGE ROOM:

Question (No. 139) as to cost of furnishing Room No. 2 and how furniture was purchased, 168.

MERCANTILE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 144) to amend, introduced, 150. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 171. Third reading, 179. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 32.)

MIDLAND ARTIFICIAL RINK:

Question (No. 69) as to whether any Government funds were used in erection of, 81.

MINES:

Question (No. 123) as to value of output of last fiscal year and what was revenue from, 143.

MINES, DEPARTMENT OF:

Report for year 1932, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 4.*)

MINIMUM WAGE BOARD, THE:

Report for year 1932, 32. (*Sessional Paper No. 39.*)

MINING ACT, THE

Bill (No. 55) to amend, introduced, 13. Second reading, 26. House in Committee, 36. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 33.)

MINING TAX ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 136) to amend, introduced, 139. Second reading, 169. House in Committee, 188. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 34.)

MONTAGUE, TOWNSHIP OF:

See *Drummond*.

MONTREAL TRUST COMPANY:

Question (No. 115) as to whether the company was appointed to conduct any of the proceedings in connection with the Abitibi Power Purchase, 142.

MOOSONEE:

Mentioned in Speech from the Throne, 3.

MORATORIUM ACT:

See *Mortgages*.

MORTGAGORS:

Further relief for, forecast in Speech from Throne, 4.

MORTGAGORS' AND PURCHASERS' RELIEF ACT, 1933:

Bill (No. 49) introduced, 52. Second reading, 93. House in Committee, 117, 126. Referred back to Committee, amended and reported, 150. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 35.)

MORTMAIN AND CHARITABLE USES ACT:

Report of Secretary and Registrar respecting the Administration of, for year ending October 31st, 1932, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 50.*)

MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 135) to amend, introduced, 139. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 171. Third reading, 179. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 36.)

MOTIONS:

1. Agricultural Development Board:

Motion for a Return showing amount of arrears owing to and how many individual debtors, etc. Ordered, 124.

2. Automobiles, Trucks and Motorcycles:

Motion for a Return showing how many were owned by Government in 1929 to 1932 inclusive, together with cost of maintenance, etc. Ordered, 124.

3. Beer and Wine:

Motion to authorize sale of, by the glass. Lapsed.

4. Brewers' Warehouses:

Motion for a Return showing to whom licenses were issued in certain centres and particulars of license fees. Ordered, 130.

MOTIONS—*Continued*

5. Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle and Nash:

Motion for a Return showing amount of money paid to, during last three fiscal years, by the Government, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario or other Commission or Service of the Government. Ordered, 130.

6. Consolidated Revenue Fund:

Motion for authority to raise a loan of \$40,000,000 on credit of. Figure altered to \$30,000,000 and motion adopted, 185.

7. Corporations Tax Act:

Motion for amendments to. Ordered, 131.

8. Criminal Insane, Hospital for, at Penetanguishene:

Motion for a Return of particulars regarding construction of. Ordered, 84. Returned, 90. (*Sessional Paper No. 43.*)

9. Motion for appointment of a Select Committee to consider the representation of the people in the Legislative Assembly, 119.

10. Government Garage:

Motion for a Return showing cost of, in years 1929 to 1932, inclusive. Ordered, 139.

11. Law Stamps:

Motion for a Return showing fees or other remuneration paid in connection with sale of, during years 1930 and 1931. Ordered, 199.

12. Liquor Control Board:

Motion for a Return showing the firms in Scotland from whom liquor was purchased last fiscal year. Ordered, 199.

13. Museum, Royal Ontario:

Motion for a Return giving particulars of cost. Ordered, 54. Returned, 56. (*Sessional Paper No. 40.*)

14. Northern Development Act:

Motion for appropriation of \$3,000,000.00, 96. Ordered, 96.

15. Ontario Power Service Corporation:

Motion for a Return of all agreements, contracts and correspondence regarding acquisition of properties of. Ordered, 215.

MOTIONS—*Continued*

16. Privilege, Question of (Gordon Waldron, K.C., and E. J. Murphy, M.P.P.):

Motion for a Select Committee to investigate. Ordered, 93. Report, 176.

17. Revenue and Expenditures:

Motion for a Return showing the amount by which each was reduced in years 1929 to 1932, inclusive, as a result of eliminating cross entries in Government system of bookkeeping. Ordered, 166.

18. Succession Duty Act:

Motion for amendment to, Ordered, 124.

19. Trenton Cold Storage Company:

Motion for a Return of all correspondence and particulars of any loan to, by Government. Ordered, 98.

20. Voters' Lists:

Motion for a Committee to improve method of preparing. Ordered and Committee appointed, 26.

MOTOR CARS AND TRUCKS:

Question (No. 32) as to number of, registered during 1931 and 1932, 41.

MOTORCYCLES:

See *Automobiles*.

MOVING PICTURE STUDIO AT TRENTON:

See *Trenton*.

MUD LAKE BRIDGE:

Question (No. 147) as to construction of, and employment of W. W. Pringle and W. G. Pringle, 184.

MULOCK, RIGHT HON. SIR WILLIAM:

Mentioned in Speech from Throne, 2.

MUNICIPAL ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 50) to amend, introduced, 51. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 97. Not reported, 164.

MUNICIPAL ACT, THE—*Continued*

2. Bill (No. 62) to amend, introduced, 22. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 27. Not reported, 164.
3. Bill (No. 65) to amend, introduced, 22. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 27. Incorporated in Bill (No. 157), 164.
4. Bill (No. 73) to amend, introduced, 27. Defeated on division on motion for Second reading, 54.
5. Bill (No. 87) to amend, introduced, 44. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 59. Not reported, 164.
6. Bill (No. 95) to amend, introduced, 60. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 90. Incorporated in Bill (No. 157), 164.
7. Bill (No. 97) to amend, introduced, 66. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 85.
8. Bill (No. 103) to amend, introduced, 74. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 106. Not reported, 164.
9. Bill (No. 132) to amend, introduced, 139. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law, 159. Incorporated in Bill (No. 157), 164.
10. Bill (No. 146) to amend, introduced under suspension of the Rules, 154. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 172.

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT, 1933, THE:

Bill (No. 157) introduced, 165. Second reading, 178. House in Committee, 191. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 37.)

MUNICIPAL BOARD, THE ONTARIO:

Report for year ending December 31st, 1932, presented, 138. (*Sessional Paper No. 24.*)

MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 141) to amend, introduced, 149. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 188. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 38.)

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISES ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 107) to amend, introduced, 78. Second reading, 98. House in Committee, 101. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 39.)

MUNICIPAL LAW, COMMITTEE* ON:

1. Authorized, 6. Appointed, 17.
2. Report, 164.

MUSEUM, ROYAL ONTARIO:

1. Order for a Return showing particulars of cost of addition to, 54. Returned, 56. (*Sessional Paper No. 40.*)
2. Statement of Revenue and Expenditure, year ending June 30th, 1932, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 35.*)

MUTUAL RELIEF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY:

Petition for an Act respecting, 9. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 28. Bill (No. 1) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported, 55. Second reading, 58. House in Committee, 62. Third reading, 79. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 87.)

MCKERROW:

See *Espanola*.

MCPHERSON, MR.:

Question (No. 131) as to salary of, from Highways Department, 159.

NEWTON, WILLIAM:

Question (No. 147) as to payment made to, in connection with construction of Mud Lake Bridge, 184.

NIAGARA, TOWN OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 11) introduced, and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 49. Reported, 91. Second reading, 97. House in Committee, 107. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 88.)

NIAGARA FALLS GENERAL HOSPITAL TRUST:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 28. Bill (No. 9) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported and fees, less penalties and cost of printing, remitted, 55. Second reading, 58. House in Committee, 62. Third reading, 79. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 89.)

NIAGARA PARKS COMMISSION, THE:

1. Report for 1932, 197. (*Sessional Paper No. 52.*)
2. Question (No. 135) as to members of, dates of appointments, remuneration of, revenue from, etc., 144.

NIXON, MR.:

Added to Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, 21.

NORMAL SCHOOL TEACHERS:

Question (No. 67) as to whether salaries were reduced during 1930, 1931 and 1932, 46.

NORTH ELMSLEY, TOWNSHIP OF:

See *Drummond*.

NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 69) to amend, introduced, 24. Second reading, 27. House in Committee, 43. Third reading, 78. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 40.)
2. Report of operations under, for year ending October 31st, 1932, 98. (*Sessional Paper No. 44.*)
3. Return of Orders-in-Council made under authority of, 32. (*Sessional Paper No. 36.*)

NORTHERN ONTARIO:

Mentioned in Speech from Throne, 3.

NORTHERN ONTARIO APPROPRIATION ACT:

Resolution for appropriation of \$3,000,000.00 under, 96.

NORTHERN ONTARIO APPROPRIATION ACT, 1933:

Bill (No. 102) introduced, 67. Resolution introduced, consent of Lieutenant-Governor intimated, passed through the House and referred to the Bill, 97. Second reading, 98. House in Committee, 127. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 41.)

NURSERY STOCK ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 100) introduced, 67. Second reading, 92. House in Committee, 101. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 42.)

NURSES ACT, THE REGISTRATION OF:

Bill (No. 84) to amend, introduced, 43. Second reading, 59. House in Committee, 63. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 54.)

OFFENCES, INDICTABLE:

Question (No. 104) as to convictions for, 1926 to 1932, 105.

OFFICE BUILDING ACT, THE FACTORY, SHOP AND:

See *Factory*.

OLD AGE PENSIONS ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 94) to amend, introduced, 59. Second reading, 92. House in Committee, 101. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 43.)
2. Question (No. 21) as to amount collected from estates of former beneficiaries and portion repaid to municipalities, 34.

ONTARIO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE:

See *Agricultural*.

ONTARIO ATHLETIC COMMISSION, THE:

See *Athletic*.

ONTARIO GOVERNMENT BUILDING, LONDON:

Question (No. 41) as to cost of erecting and furnishing, 42.

ONTARIO HISTORICAL SOCIETY, THE:

Report for year 1932, 32. (*Sessional Paper No. 38.*)

ONTARIO-MANITOBA ROAD:

Question (No. 62) as to cost of section between Keewatin and Manitoba Boundary, etc., 58.

ONTARIO MARKETING BOARD:

See *Marketing*.

ONTARIO POWER SERVICE CORPORATION, THE:

1. Bill (No. 137) respecting the acquisition of the Properties of, introduced, 139. Second reading carried on Division, 175. House in Committee, 200. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 1.)
2. Question (No. 5) as to purchase of Abitibi Power Development from, by the Government, 67.
3. Question (No. 50) as to liabilities of, outstanding at time Government entered into negotiations for the purchase of, 70.
4. Question (No. 65) as to power delivered by, to Sudbury Mining area in 1932 and to February 1st, 1933, 81.
5. Question (No. 71) as to whether any bonds of the Corporation were owned by Canadian General Investments, Limited, 140.
6. Question (No. 79) as to contracts for power developed by, held by Hydro-Electric Power Commission before acquisition by Province, of Abitibi Power site, 71.
7. Question (No. 114) as to whether any bonds of the Corporation were owned by the Premier, or any member of the Cabinet or by the Chairman or any member of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission, 142.
8. Question (No. 115) as to whether the Montreal Trust Company were appointed by Hydro-Electric Power Commission to act in connection with acquisition of properties of the Corporation, 142.
9. Question (No. 145) as to whether the Government, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission or the Montreal Trust Company can supply information respecting the ownership of bonds of the company not turned in on Abitibi deal, 182.
10. Motion for an Order for a Return of all agreements, contracts and correspondence in connection with the acquisition of the assets of the Company, 215.

ONTARIO RESEARCH FOUNDATION, THE:

See *Research*.

ONTARIO VETERINARY COLLEGE, THE:

See *Veterinary*.

OPTOMETRY ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 82) to repeal, 43. Lapsed.

ORDER PAPER:

Government business to be placed on, on Fridays and Wednesdays, 108.

OSTEOPATHIC PRACTITIONERS:

Select Committee appointed to consider amendments to Medical Act requested by, 174.

OTTAWA, CITY OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 12. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 32) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Reported, 65. Second reading, 73. House in Committee, 86. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 90.)

OTTAWA, COLLEGE OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 12. Reported, 19. Bill (No. 34) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 20. Reported, 148. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 172. Third reading, 180. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 106.)

OTTAWA, LES REVERENDS PERES OBLATS DE L'IMMACULEE CONCEPTION DE MARIE:

See *Marie*.

PALMER, GEORGE:

Question (No. 131) as to payments to, by Highways Department, 159.

PARIS:

Question (No. 146) as to total sales at liquor store in, and cost of administration. Return ordered, 199.

PARLIAMENT BUILDING, EAST BLOCK:

See *East Block*.

PATTERSON, WILLIAM A.:

Petition for an Act respecting the Township of North Scarborough.

See *Scarborough*.

PELICAN FALLS:

Question (No. 112) as to lease of power on, 123.

PENETANGUISHENE, HOSPITAL FOR CRIMINAL INSANE:

Motion for a Return of particulars regarding construction of. Return ordered, 84. Returned, 90. (*Sessional Paper No. 43.*)

PENNY BANK OF ONTARIO:

Question (No. 121) as to whether it is under jurisdiction of the Province, and if any provincial money paid to, 128.

PENSIONS, OLD AGE:

See *Old Age*.

PERE MARQUETTE RAILWAY:

Question (No. 45) as to the total cost of building a bridge over the railway in the Corporation of Blenheim on No. 3 Highway, 52.

PETERBOROUGH, CITY OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 12. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 28. Bill (No. 31) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported, 74. Second reading, 85. House in Committee, 87. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 91.)

PIERDON, W. G.:

Question (No. 74) as to present salary and last salary increase, 110.

PIONEERS OF UPPER CANADA:

Supply ordered for Members of Legislature, 118.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 54) to amend, introduced, 55. Second reading and referred to Committee on Municipal Law. 64. Reported, 164. House in Committee, 187. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 46.)

POLICE, ONTARIO PROVINCIAL:

Report of Commissioner for year ending October 31st, 1932, 112. (*Sessional Paper No. 45.*)

POPE, W. W.:

Question (No. 43) as to present salary of, and last increase, 109.

PORT ARTHUR, CITY OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 19. Bill (No. 4) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 20. Reported, 99. Second reading, 106. House in Committee, 112. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 92.)

POWDRELL AND ALEXANDER:

See *Cornwall*.

POWER COMMISSION ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 133) to amend, introduced, 139. Second reading, 186. House in Committee, 200. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 47.)
2. Bill (No. 156) to amend, introduced, 165. Second reading defeated on division, 214.

POWER COMMISSION ACT, 1933, THE:

Bill (No. 153) introduced, 155. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 190. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 47.)

POWER SERVICE CORPORATION, THE ONTARIO:

See *Ontario*.

PREMIER, THE:

Question (No. 114) as to whether he held any bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation at time of Abitibi Power purchase, 142.

PRESCOTT COUNTY:

Question (No. 52) as to amount of King's Highway built in, and cost of. Withdrawn.

PRICE, HARRY I.:

1. Report of his election presented to the House, 5.
2. Takes his seat in the House, 6.
3. Moves address in reply to Speech from Throne, 8.

PRINGLE, W. G.:

Question (No. 147) as to his employment on construction of Mud Lake Bridge, 184.

PRINGLE, W. W.:

Question (No. 147) as to his employment on construction of Mud Lake Bridge, 184.

PRINTING, COMMITTEE ON:

1. Authorized, 6.
2. Appointed, 17.
3. Reports, 38, 118.

PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES:

Report on, for year ending October 31st, 1932, 179. (*Sessional Paper No. 18.*)

PRIVATE BILLS, COMMITTEE ON:

1. Authorized, 6. Appointed, 17.
2. Reports, 49, 55, 65, 74, 91, 99, 117, 148, 174.
3. Time for presenting petitions and introducing Bills extended, 29.
4. Time for presenting Reports of Committees extended, 118.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, COMMITTEE ON:

Authorized, 6. Appointed, 16.

PRIVILEGE, QUESTION OF:

1. Motion for a Select Committee to inquire into breach of privilege by one Gordon Waldron, K.C., 93.
2. Motion withdrawn and new motion substituted, 93.
3. Report, 176.

PROPERTY ACT, CONVEYANCING AND:

See *Conveyancing*.

PROPERTIES, RESIDENCE:

See *Residence*.

PROROGATION OF THE HOUSE, 227.

PROTESTANT CHILDREN'S VILLAGE, OTTAWA:

Petition for an Act respecting, 12. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 36) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Reported and fees, less penalties and cost of printing, remitted, 65. Second reading, 73. House in Committee, 86. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 93.)

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS:

Conference of, with Federal Government mentioned in Speech from the Throne, 2.

PROVINCE, THE:

Question (No. 28) as to accounts due by, at October 31st, 1932, 102.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS:

1. Submission of, to House referred to in Speech from Throne, 4.
2. Presented to House and referred to Committee, 99. (*Sessional Paper No. 1.*)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, COMMITTEE ON:

1. Authorized, 6. Appointed, 17.
2. Report, 163.

PUBLIC COMMERCIAL VEHICLE ACT:

See *Vehicle*.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, THE:

See *Health*.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS:

See *Hospitals*.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 90) to amend, introduced, 56. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 84.

PUBLIC (CIVIL) SERVICE ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 142) to amend, introduced, 149. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 188. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 52.)

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION BOARD:

Report for year ending October 31st, 1932, 90. (*Sessional Paper No. 41.*)

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION FUND:

Question (No. 25) as to total amount now standing to credit of Fund and how invested, 35.

PUBLIC SERVICE WORKS ON HIGHWAYS ACT:

Bill (No. 117) to amend, introduced, 113. Second reading and referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 146. Not reported, 173.

PUBLIC SERVICE:

See also *Civil Service*.

PUBLIC VEHICLE ACT, THE:

See *Vehicle*.

PUBLIC WELFARE, DEPARTMENT OF:

See *Welfare*.

PUBLIC WORKS, DEPARTMENT OF:

Report for year 1932, 37. (*Sessional Paper No. 8.*)

PULPWOOD CONSERVATION ACT, 1929:

Question (No. 86) as to statements filed under extensions granted and collections made under, 105.

QUESTIONS:

1. As to the personnel of the Agricultural Development Board, 25.
2. As to whether Mr. W. N. Tilley, K.C., or any member of the firm of Tilley, Johnston, Thomson and Parmenter, Barristers, or the firm itself has been retained by the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission in any capacity since January 1st, 1926, 120.

QUESTIONS—*Continued*

3. As to the total cost of the Hydro Enquiry Commission, 1932, 25.
4. As to whether the Barrie Packing Plant asked the Government for any financial assistance in the reorganization of their business, 26.
5. As to what date the Government offered to take over the Abitibi Power Development from the Ontario Power Service Corporation, 67.
6. As to whether Mr. W. N. Tilley or any member of the firm of Tilley, Johnston, Thomson, and Parmenter, Barristers, or the firm itself has been retained by the Government or the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in connection with the acquiring of the Abitibi Power Development, 44.
7. As to the total sum of money paid to the firm of Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle & Nash, Accountants, or to any member or employee of the firm during the last three fiscal years by (a) the Government; (b) Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario; (c) any other outside public service department of the Government. Return ordered, 130.
8. As to whether there is a special Commission known as the Budget Committee at work in the service of the Province; also as to the personnel, 22.
9. As to the total cost occasioned by adverse exchange rates during each of the last three fiscal years to (a) the Government; (b) the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, 79.
10. As to the cost to the Province to have the portrait of Honourable G. H. Ferguson painted and hung, 33.
11. As to the number of employees on the permanent staff of The Workmen's Compensation Board, 122.
12. As to whether the position of Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board is a full-time or part-time job, 67.
13. As to amount expended on the road from Espanola to McKerrow during each of the years 1931 and 1932, 56.
14. As to how many yards of gravel were purchased for the Espanola-Little Current Highway in each of the years 1931 and 1932, 56.
15. As to amounts paid for the right-of-way for highway purposes across La Cloche Island, and to whom were the payments made, 56.

QUESTIONS—*Continued*

16. As to what amount was expended on the roads of the constituency of Algoma by the Government during each of the years 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932, 56.
17. As to what amount was expended on the roads of Manitoulin Island by the Government during each of the years 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932, 56.
18. As to what amount of money was spent for direct relief in the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, in each of the towns, Espanola, Blind River, Thessalon, 33.
19. As to what is the amount in each of the years 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932, by which the totals of Revenue and Expenditure are reduced by the adoption of the new system of bookkeeping by which cross entries are eliminated. Return ordered, 166.
20. As to what amount of money has been set apart in each of the fiscal years in the Highway Improvement Fund since the creation of the said fund as provided in Section 7 of The Highway Improvement Act, 33.
21. As to what amounts have been collected by the Government from the estates of deceased persons, who in their lifetime were in receipt of Old Age Pensions, 33.
22. As to the total number of chattel mortgages taken by the Agricultural Development Board in the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, 39.
23. As to what amount of money was spent by the Government in conducting the census of traffic in each of the fiscal years ending on October 31st, in the years 1931 and 1932, 33.
24. As to the total amount of money paid during the last fiscal year to Crown Counsel conducting criminal prosecutions at Assizes other than amounts paid to local Crown Attorneys, 33.
25. As to the total amount now standing to the credit of the Public Service Superannuation Fund, 35.
26. As to the total amount now standing to the credit of the Teachers' and Inspectors' Superannuation Fund, 35.
27. As to the total amount of reserves of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission for Ontario and in what securities are these reserves held, 39.
28. As to the total amount of outstanding accounts payable by the Province as at October 31st, 1932, 102.

QUESTIONS—*Continued*

29. As to the total cost of constructing the bridge on No. 7 Highway, paving approaches, etc., 52.
30. As to how many retail gasoline vendors are at present in arrears in paying the Gasoline Tax to the Government, 44.
31. As to the total amount of Capital Expenditure of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in each of the fiscal years 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932, 45.
32. As to the total amount of Gasoline Tax collected in each of the fiscal years 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932, 41.
33. As to the total number of employees in the Civil Service (a) inside; (b) outside; in each of the fiscal years 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932, 67.
34. As to the identity of the Clerk of the Surrogate Court for the County of Halton, 35.
35. As to whether the Government had efficiency experts working during the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, in any of the Government Departments to ascertain whether improved methods in operating can be secured, 60.
36. As to the total cost to date of the second section of the new East Block of the Parliament Buildings, 36.
37. As to the total cost to date of surveying for the third or centre King's Highway through the Counties of Halton and Peel, 36.
38. As to the total amount of money collected by the Government from race tracks during the fiscal year of 1932, 41.
39. As to how many allowances of refunds of Gasoline Tax have been made by the Government to individuals or companies after the six months' limit for application for refund has expired, 60.
40. As to how many farm mortgage loans were made in 1932 by the Agricultural Development Board, 42.
41. As to the total cost of erecting and furnishing the Ontario Government Building in London, England, 42.
42. As to the number of (a) permanent; (b) temporary, and occasional employees in Ontario, England, or elsewhere, outside Ontario in the Department of Colonization and Immigration during the last three fiscal years, 94.

QUESTIONS—*Continued*

43. As to the number of (a) permanent employees; (b) temporary employees and occasional employees on the staff of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario during each of the last three fiscal years, 109.
44. As to the total excess cost of that portion of power from the Gatineau for which we pay in United States funds, because of the adverse exchange rates, 60.
45. As to the total cost of building the bridge over Pere Marquette Railway in the Corporation of Blenheim on No. 3 Highway, 52.
46. As to whether Police Magistrate Emerson Coatsworth, K.C., tendered to the Attorney-General or to the Government his resignation as a Police Commissioner, or as Senior Police Magistrate at any time during 1932, 140.
47. As to how much Crown timber land is held by private interest in Thunder Bay District, 79.
48. As to the total amount of money advanced to the T. & N.O. Railway, 67.
49. As to the total profit of the Liquor Control Board for each of the fiscal years ending October 31st, 1931 and 1932. 67.
50. As to the outstanding liabilities, if any, of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, when the Government entered into negotiations with the Company for the purchase of its assets, 67.
51. As to what method has been in use in dispensing relief in the unorganized territory in Northern Ontario, 46.
52. As to how many miles of King's Highways have been built in Prescott County. Withdrawn.
53. As to how many miles of King's Highways have been built in Russell County. Withdrawn.
54. As to the total cost to date of the new wing of the Royal Ontario Museum. Return ordered, 54.
55. As to the total investment in Provincial Government Buildings in Toronto, 87.
56. As to the total cost of the Ontario Research Foundation to date, 61.
57. As to the cost of furnishing the new wing in the East Block, 46.

QUESTIONS—*Continued*

58. As to the cost to the University of Toronto of the Botanical Buildings, 52.
59. As to the capital construction cost of University of Toronto buildings in each of the last five years, 53.
60. As to the cost during the last fiscal year of snow removal from King's Highway No. 2, 53.
61. As to whether the Sinking Fund Reserves of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission as shown in the Annual Report include the \$20,000,000 equity of the municipalities, 67.
62. As to the total cost to date of the Ontario-Manitoba road between Keewatin and the Manitoba boundary, 58.
63. As to how much money has been expended on the Trans-Canada Highway by the Ontario Government, 61.
64. As to the amount of power supplied to the Sudbury mining area by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario during the years 1930, 1931, 1932, and in 1933, to February 1st, 80.
65. As to the amount of power supplied to the Sudbury mining area by the Ontario Power Service Corporation during 1932 and in 1933 to February 1st, 79.
66. As to what arrangements have been made with Colonel H. D. Lockhart-Gordon for remuneration for services on the Budget Committee, 71.
67. As to whether salaries of the Normal School teachers have been reduced during the years 1930, 1931 and 1932, 46.
68. As to the cost to date of the Game and Fish Committee appointed two years ago under the Chairmanship of the Honourable Mr. Black, 122.
69. As to whether any Government funds were used in the erection of the Midland artificial rink, 80.
70. As to what position, if any, does Edward Chauvin of Noelville hold in the services of the Government of Ontario, 140.
71. As to whether Hydro Commissioner Right Honourable Arthur Meighen is, or has been, within the last year, Chairman or President of the Canadian General Investments Limited, 140.
72. As to whether the Provincial Government is buying or handling clothing, coats and shoes, etc., for relief purposes, 61.

QUESTIONS—*Continued*

73. As to whether the Government had a portrait painted of the Honourable William Donald Ross, former Lieutenant-Governor, 82.
74. As to the present salary of each of the following officials on the staff of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission: Dr. T. H. Hogg, Chief Hydraulic Engineer; E. T. J. Brandon, Chief Electrical Engineer; W. R. Robertson, Chief of the Railway Division; H. C. Don Carlos, Chief Operating Engineer; W. G. Pierdon, Chief Accountant; A. E. Davidson, Chief of Transmission and Distribution; W. P. Dobson, Chief of Testing and Research Department, 110.
75. As to how many Crown Forests Reserves have been created under The Forestry Act, 82.
76. As to how much land has been (a) leased; (b) purchased; (c) expropriated for forestry purposes under the provisions of The Forestry Act, R.S.O. 1927, Cap. 41, since the passing of said Act, 166.
77. As to the identity of the members of the Forestry Board provided for in Section 16 of The Forestry Act, 82.
78. As to how many square miles of pulpwood limits or concessions are at present held by the Abitibi Power and Paper Company or its receivers or liquidator of any of its subsidiaries under license, lease, or permit from the Crown, 102.
79. As to whom did the Hydro-Electric Power Commission have contracts with for the delivery of power to be developed by the Ontario Power Service Corporation prior to the acquisition by the Province of the Abitibi Power site, 71.
80. As to the names of the parties from East Simcoe who have received employment as foremen, overseers, or superintendents in the camps for the unemployed in Northern Ontario for the year 1931-1932, 166.
81. As to the page of the Public Accounts on which the statement "Comparison of Current Expenditure on Highways to Current Revenue for Highway Purposes" appears as shown on page 52 of the Budget Address delivered March 12th, 1931, 71.
82. As to how many square miles of Crown land held under license, lease or permit for the cutting of timber or pulpwood have been cancelled or surrendered to the Crown under the provisions of The Forestry Act, 83.
83. As to how many licenses, leases or permits are at present in effect with respect to timber or/and pulpwood lands in Algonquin Park, 104.

QUESTIONS—*Continued*

84. As to how much was paid by the Government during the last fiscal year for cutting and trimming trees on the King's Highways, 71.
85. As to how much was paid by the Government during the last fiscal year for cutting grass and weeds on the King's Highways, 83.
86. As to how many companies have in each of the years 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932 filed the statements required by Section 3 of The Pulpwood Conservation Act, 1929, 105.
87. As to whether the Agricultural Representatives were called into conference at the O.A.C. in December of 1932, 83.
88. As to the cost of the Ontario Government garage in the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive, 124.
89. As to how many Government cars are reserved for the use of the Ministers, 198.
90. As to the net cost to the Province for the building of the C.N.R. subway on No. 7 Highway near Breslau, 71.
91. As to the number of automobiles, trucks, and motorcycles, owned by the Ontario Government in each of the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive, and cost of maintenance. Return ordered, 124.
92. As to when the King's Highway No. 30 from Brighton to Campbellford was taken over as a Provincial Highway, 84.
93. As to the amount spent by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in (1) wages and (2) salaries, in (a) operation, (b) maintenance and (c) administration during the last fiscal year, 123.
94. As to whether the Government advertised for tenders for the construction of a ferry boat to run between Manitoulin Island and the Bruce Peninsula, 88.
95. As to the names of the municipalities, the debentures of which are held by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission for Ontario, accepted as payment upon the sale to such municipalities of the local Hydro-Electric Power Commission system, 88.
96. As to the total cost to date of constructing and equipping the laboratories of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, 155.
97. As to the total cost of the short-wave experimental radio stations of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission during the last fiscal year, 110.

QUESTIONS — *Continued*

98. As to the total cost to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of its Forestry Division during the last fiscal year, 110.
99. As to the total cost of the Legal Department of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission for salaries and services of all connected with said department during the last fiscal year, 123.
100. As to the identity of the auditors of the accounts of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, 158.
101. As to what revenue accrued to the Niagara System of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission by the sale of power to the Canada Niagara Power Company as mentioned on page 14 of the Annual Report, 1931, 89.
102. As to how much was spent by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission during the last fiscal year on publicity, 95.
103. As to the total cost for the year 1932 to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of the publication known as "The Bulletin," 95.
104. As to the number accused of drunkenness before the Courts of Ontario in each of the years 1926 and 1932, 105.
105. As to the date, and under what authority, did the Workmen's Compensation Board first use money from the Accident Fund to pay a portion of the cost of group insurance of members of the Board and employees, 123.
106. As to whether Ernest Westbury, former Reeve of York Township, is now in the employ of the Ontario Government, 89.
107. As to how many foreclosures of mortgages have been made by the Agricultural Development Board during the last two fiscal years, 96.
108. As to whether there is an organization known as the Agricultural Advisory Committee, 106.
109. As to whether the residence and administration building of the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph is completed, 96.
110. As to how many loans have been granted to rural Hydro consumers under The Rural Power Districts Loan Act, 167.
111. As to the total sale during the last fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, by the Liquor Commission of (a) Spirituous Liquor, (b) Wine, (c) Beer, 141.

QUESTIONS—*Continued*

112. As to whether a lease for power purposes has ever been given on Pelican Falls, near Sioux Lookout, 123.
113. As to the total amount of insurance carried by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, 156.
114. As to whether the Premier or any member of the Government, the Chairman of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, or either of the Commissioners, held or controlled any of the bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation prior to, at the time, or subsequent to, the making of the public offer by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, at the request of the Government, to the holder of bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation to exchange such bonds for debentures of the Commission guaranteed by the Province of Ontario, 142.
115. As to whether the Montreal Trust Company has been given any authority, or appointed to do any work in connection with the public offer made by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, at the request of the Government, to holders of bonds of Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited, to exchange such bonds for debentures of the Commission guaranteed by the Province of Ontario. If so, what was the nature of the work or authority. How was it given and on what date, 142.
116. As to the amount of money spent on the Haliburton-Eagle Lake Road, 127.
117. As to what amount, if any, was taken from the Contingent Fund of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission during the last fiscal year, 155.
118. As to when the office of Local Registrar of the Supreme Court at Lindsay became vacant, 143.
119. As to the amount spent on relief measures in King's Highways in Ontario, 128.
120. As to what amount of money has been spent on the Coboconk-Dorset Road, 128.
121. As to whether the Penny Bank of Ontario is in any way under the control and inspection of the Provincial Government, 128.
122. As to whether the Department of Highways has issued any special licenses to truckers on behalf of the railways, 180.
123. As to the total value of the output of the Ontario Mines in the last fiscal year, 143.

QUESTIONS—*Continued*

124. As to how many miles of rural Hydro lines have been constructed in the County of Glengarry, 158.
125. As to the number of firms or companies assessed under The Apprenticeship Act in the years 1931 and 1932, 144.
126. As to the number of Civil Servants in the employ of the Government over the age of sixty-five years, 129.
127. As to the total amount in arrears to the Agricultural Development Board. Return Ordered, 124.
128. As to the quantity of cheese exported by the Ontario Marketing Board (a) 1931, (b) 1932, 129.
129. As to whom has the Ontario Liquor Control Board allotted (a) Brewers' Warehouse Licenses in Toronto, Ottawa, London, Windsor, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Niagara Falls, Brantford, Chatham, St. Thomas, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, North Bay, Fort William, Port Arthur, Walkerville, Oshawa, Brockville and East Windsor. (b) Who owns each warehouse. Return ordered, 130.
130. As to how many Gunnings have been paid by cheques from the Highway Department since 1926 on the Talbotville Division, County of Elgin, 159.
131. As to the salary paid to Mr. McPherson for his services as Superintendent of London Division, Department of Highways, 159.
132. As to whether any complaint has been made to the Department of Highways regarding irregularities in the Talbotville Division, 129.
133. As to what Crown Lands Offices have been closed by the Department of Lands and Forests since November 1st, 1931, 167.
134. As to the total amount borrowed by the Province for the financing of Provincial Highways for the years 1924 to 1932, both inclusive, 124.
135. As to the identity of the members of the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Parks Commission, 144.
136. As to the number of counties and provisional judicial districts in which Cemetery Commissions have been set up under The Cemetery Act, 1931, 129.
137. As to the number of first and second year apprentices now enrolled under The Apprenticeship Act. What numbers were there in 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, 144.

QUESTIONS—Continued.

138. As to what undeveloped waterpowers are held by the Great Lakes Paper Company, Limited, under lease from the Crown, 168.
139. As to (a) the total cost to the Province in refurnishing Members' Lounge Room No. 2. (b) What were the items making up this order and cost of each item, 168.
140. As to how many are employed at the Moving Picture Studio at Trenton, 180.
141. As to whether any Department of the Government purchased a boat to be remodelled for use as a ferry to and from Manitoulin Island or adjacent waters, 169.
142. As to what amount of money has been borrowed and charged to capital account up to October 31st, 1932, for construction of Highways, 181.
143. As to what amount has been set aside for Highway debt retirement since the inauguration of the debt retirement scheme, 182.
144. As to who is Superintendent of Child Welfare, Kenora District, 182.
145. As to whether the Government or the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, or its agent, The Montreal Trust Company, has any information concerning the ownership of the balance of the Ontario Power Service Corporation bonds not yet turned in for exchange, or can such information be secured, 182.
146. As to purchases of liquor or other supplies in Scotland by the Liquor Control Board during the last fiscal year. Return ordered, 199.
147. As to whether the Department of Public Works or the Department of Northern Development (Roads and Bridges) built the bridge known locally as Mud Lake Bridge, Addington County, 184.
148. As to the number of employees of the Hydro Commission of the age of 65 years. Lapsed.
149. As to whether tenders were called for the plastering of the East Wing of the Parliament Buildings, 199.
150. As to fees or remunerations paid in connection with the sale of law stamps during the years 1930 and 1931, giving names and addresses and occupations of recipients, and amounts paid to each recipient. Return ordered, 199.

RACE TRACKS:

Question (No. 38) as to amount collected by Government from each track in 1932, 41.

RADIO THERAPY, ACT RESPECTING THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE OF:

Bill (No. 52) introduced, 52. Second reading, 77. House in Committee, 100. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 44.)

RADIUM PRODUCTS:

Plant for development of, referred to in Speech from Throne, 4.

RAILWAYS:

Question (No. 122) as to whether special highway licenses have been issued to any truckers on behalf of, 180.

RAILWAYS, COMMITTEE ON:

Authorized, 6. Appointed, 16.

RECORDS AND ARCHIVES, DEPARTMENT OF:

Report for year 1932, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 30.*)

REFORMATORIES:

See *Prisons*.

RELIEF:

1. Appointment of Advisory Committee on, reported in Speech from Throne, 4.
2. Question (No. 51) as to method employed in dispensing relief in unorganized districts in Northern Ontario, 46.
3. Question (No. 72) as to whether the Government is buying or has delegated the buying of clothing, etc., for relief purposes, 61.

RELIEF LAND SETTLEMENT ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 110) introduced, 87. Second reading, 100. House in Committee, 108. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 55.)

RELIEF, ACT RESPECTING UNEMPLOYMENT:

Bill (No. 161) introduced, 166. Second reading, 178. House in Committee, 191. Referred back to Committee, amended and reported, 217. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 65.)

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, ACT
RESPECTING:

See *Legislative*.

RESEARCH FOUNDATION, THE ONTARIO:

1. Report on investigation of Northern Ontario Lignite, 148. (*Sessional Paper No. 46.*)
2. Question (No. 56) as to cost of, to date, 61.

RESIDENCE PROPERTIES, ACT RESPECTING EQUITIES OF REDEMPTION IN:

Bill (No. 131) introduced, 135. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 161.

RETURNS:

Return to an Order of the House of March 24th, 1932, for the production of the contract between the Beauharnois Power Company and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, the Order-in-Council confirming same and all correspondence, 148. (*Sessional Paper No. 47.*)

RETURNS ORDERED:

1. Showing the total cost to date of the new wing of the Royal Ontario Museum and particulars of contracts. Returned, 56. (*Sessional Paper No. 40.*)
2. Showing particulars of tenders called for in connection with construction of the Hospital for Criminal Insane at Penetanguishene. Returned, 90. (*Sessional Paper No. 43.*)
3. Showing copies of all correspondence and agreements between the Government and the Trenton Cold Storage Company, and particulars of any loans by Government to the Company, etc., 98.
4. Showing number of automobiles, trucks and motorcycles owned by the Government in the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive, and cost of same, 124.
5. Showing the total amount in arrears to the Agricultural Development Board, how many individuals in arrears and length of delinquency period, 124.
6. Showing amount paid to Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle and Nash during last three fiscal years by the Government, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission or any outside public service department of the Government, 130.
7. Showing to whom Brewers' Warehouse Licenses were issued by the Liquor Control Board in certain centres, payment of fees for, etc., 130.

RETURNS ORDERED—*Continued*

8. Showing cost of the Government Garage for the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive, how many new trucks, motorcycles and automobiles were purchased during the same years and cost of each one purchased, 139.
9. Showing by what amount in each of years 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932, the totals of Revenue and Expenditure were reduced by eliminating the system of cross entries, 166.
10. Showing from what firms in Scotland the Liquor Control Board purchased supplies during last fiscal year and amount of gross business done in the same period by the liquor stores at Woodstock, Brantford and Paris, 199.
11. Showing what fees or remuneration was paid in connection with the sale of Law Stamps in the years 1930-1931 and the names of recipients of such fees, etc., 199.
12. Showing all agreements, contracts and correspondence regarding the acquisition of the properties of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, 215.

REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES:

Question (No. 19) as to amount in 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932 by which the totals of, have been reduced by adoption of new system of bookkeeping by which cross entries are eliminated. Return ordered, 166.

RICKARD, H. P.:

Examined by Committee on Public Accounts, 164.

ROAD SYSTEMS, COUNTY AND TOWNSHIP:

Expenditures on, referred to in Speech from Throne, 4.

ROBERTSON, W. R.:

Question (No. 74) as to present salary and last salary increase, 110.

ROMAN CATHOLIC EPISCOPAL CORPORATION OF THE DIOCESE OF LONDON:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 28. Bill (No. 19) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported, 74. Fees, less penalties and cost of printing, remitted, 74. Second reading, 85. House in Committee, 87. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 94.)

ROSS, HONOURABLE WILLIAM DONALD:

1. Mentioned in Speech from Throne, 2.
2. Question (No. 73) as to painting portrait of, by whom painted, and cost, 82.

ROYAL COMMISSION RE HYDRO MATTERS:

See *Hydro*.

ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM:

1. Question (No. 54) as to cost of new wing and how was tender let. Return ordered, 54 Returned, 56. (*Sessional Paper No. 40*).
2. Statement of Revenue and Expenditure, year ending June 30th, 1932, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 35*.)

RULES OF THE HOUSE:

1. Provisions of Rule No. 56 suspended, 108, 138, 154.
2. Provisions of Rule No. 36 suspended, 154.
3. Provisions of Rule No. 60 suspended, 29, 118.

RURAL POWER DISTRICT LOANS ACT:

Question (No. 110) as to number of loans granted under, and amount thereof, 167.

RUSSELL COUNTY:

Question (No. 53) as to King's Highways built in, and cost of. Withdrawn.

ST. CATHARINES, CITY OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 12. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 39) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Reported, 74. Second reading, 85. House in Committee, 87. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 95.)

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, DEVELOPMENT OF:

Mentioned in Speech from the Throne, 3.

ST. JOSEPH, SISTERS OF, OF DIOCESE OF TORONTO:

Petition for an Act respecting, 15. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 19. Bill (No. 6) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 20. Reported, 74. Second reading, 85. House in Committee, 87. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 99.)

ST. PATRICK'S ASYLUM, OTTAWA:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 29. Bill (No. 3) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported, 49. Fees, less penalties and cost of printing, remitted, 49. Second reading, 58. House in Committee, 62. Third reading, 79. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 96.)

SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 123) to amend, introduced, 114. Second reading, 134. House in Committee, 151. Third reading, 172. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 57.)

SANATORIA, HOSPITALS AND:

See *Hospitals*.

SANDWICH, TOWN OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 29. Bill (No. 15) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 31. Reported, 99. Second reading, 107. House in Committee, 112. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 97.)

SCARBOROUGH, TOWNSHIP OF NORTH:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 23) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 51. Reported, 174. Second reading, 186. House in Committee, 217. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 98.)

SCHOOL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 124) to amend, introduced, 114. Second reading, 146. House in Committee, 151. Referred back to Committee, amended and reported, 216. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 58.)

SCHOOLS, RURAL, PUBLIC AND SEPARATE:

See *Education*.

SECRETARY AND REGISTRAR, THE PROVINCIAL:

1. Report on administration of The Companies Act, The Extra-Provincial Corporations Act, The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act and The Companies Information Act for 1932, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 50.*)
2. Announces prorogation, 227.

SESSIONAL INDEMNITY:

Motion for payment in full to all Members, carried, 219.

SESSIONAL PAPERS, STATUTES AND:

Report *re* distribution of, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 33.*)

SHIPLEY, MR.:

Question (No. 131) as to salary paid to, by Highways Department, 159.

SHOP AND OFFICE BUILDING ACT, THE FACTORY:

See *Factory*.

SIMCOE EAST:

Question (No. 80) as to employment of men from, as foremen, overseers, etc., in Northern Ontario Unemployment Camps in 1931-1932, 166.

SIOUX LOOKOUT:

Question (No. 112) as to lease of power rights near, 123.

SMITH, R. M.:

Examined by Committee on Public Accounts, 164.

SNOW REMOVAL:

See *King's Highways*.

SPEAKER, MR.:

1. Reads a copy of His Honour's Speech, 5.
2. Informs the House of result of by-election, 5.
3. Informs the House that the Clerk has laid upon the Table a report of the by-election held during recess, 5.

SPEAKER, MR.—*Continued*

4. Presents Bills for Royal Assent, 220.
5. Presents Supply Bill, 225.

STANDING ORDERS, COMMITTEE ON:

1. Authorized, 6. Appointed, 12.
2. Reports, 19, 28, 47, 64.
3. Recommends extension of time for presenting petitions and introducing Bills, 29.

STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1933:

Bill (No. 147) introduced, 154. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 199. Referred back to Committee, amended and reported, 217. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 59.)

STATUTES AND SESSIONAL PAPERS:

Report *re* distribution of, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 33.*)

STENOGRAPHIC REPORTERS ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 115) to amend, introduced, 109. Second reading, 115. House in Committee, 126. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 60.)

STRICKLAND, MR.:

Added to Committee on Legal Bills, 21.

STRIKING COMMITTEE:

1. Appointed, 9.
2. Reports, 12, 16.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 112) to amend, introduced, 102. Resolution introduced, Lieutenant-Governor's approval intimated, passed through the House and referred to the Bill, 125. Second reading, 126. House in Committee, 135. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 61.)

SUDBURY MINING AREA:

1. Question (No. 64) as to power delivered to, by Hydro-Electric Power Commission, 81.
2. Question (No. 65) as to power supplied to, by Ontario Power Service Corporation, 81.

SUPERANNUATION FUND, PUBLIC SERVICE:

See Public Service.

SUPERANNUATION FUND, TEACHERS AND INSPECTORS:

See Teachers.

SUPPLY:

1. Motion to go into Committee of, 86.
2. Budget speech delivered, 99.
3. Debate on, 100, 113.
4. Amendment moved and debate on, 113, 117, 119, 120, 135.
5. Amendment lost on Division, 136.
6. Main motion carried on Division, 137.
7. In the Committee, 138, 147, 152, 153, 161, 192.
8. Amendment to motion to go into Committee defeated on Division, 152.
9. Concurrence voted, 161, 201.
10. House in Committee of Ways and Means, 213.

SUPPLY BILL, THE:

Bill (No. 164) introduced and read a First, Second and Third time, 214.
Royal Assent, 225. (23 George V, c. 62.)

SURROGATE COURTS ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 89) to amend, introduced, 44. Second reading, 78. House in Committee, 107, 126. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 63.)

TALBOTVILLE DIVISION OF HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT:

1. Question (No. 130) as to payments made to certain men named Gunning, Fife and Eckford, 159.
2. Question (No. 132) as to whether any irregularities were reported in connection with, 129.

TEACHERS' AND INSPECTORS' SUPERANNUATION FUND:

Question (No. 26) as to total amount now standing to credit of, and how invested, 35.

TECK, TOWNSHIP OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 16. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 29. Bill (No. 37) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 29. Reported, 49. Second reading, 58. House in Committee, 62. Third reading, 79. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 100.)

TEMISKAMING AND NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY:

Mentioned in Speech from the Throne, 3.

TEMISKAMING AND NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY COMMISSION:

1. Report for year ending October 31st, 1932, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 23.*)
2. Question (No. 2) as to whether the Commission has retained Mr. W. N. Tilley or the firm of Tilley, Johnson, Thompson, and Parmenter since January 1st, 1926, 120.
3. Question (No. 48) as to what amounts have been advanced to, by the Government and interest thereon, 69.

THEATRES AND CINEMATOGRAPHS ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 86) to amend, introduced, 44. Second reading, 59. House in Committee, 63. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 64.)

THESSALON:

Question (No. 18) as to amount of direct relief expended in, during fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, 33.

THOUSAND ISLANDS BRIDGE COMPANY:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 19. Bill (No. 27) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 20. Reported, 149. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 172. Third reading, 180. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 101.)

THRESHERS, ACT TO GIVE THEM A LIEN IN CERTAIN CASES:

Bill (No. 51) introduced, 51. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 73.

THRONE, SPEECH FROM:

1. Delivered by Lieutenant-Governor, 2.
2. Motion for consideration of, 6.
3. Motion for address in reply, 8.
4. Debate on, 8, 21.
5. Amendment moved, 21.
6. Amendment to amendment moved, 21.
7. Debate on, 21, 24, 31, 37, 51, 55, 66, 75.
8. Amendment to amendment defeated on Division, 75.
9. Amendment defeated on Division, 76.
10. Main motion carried on Division, 77.
11. Address authorized, 77.

THUNDER BAY DISTRICT:

Question (No. 47) as to Crown timber lands held by private interests and what amount of payments is in default, 79.

TILLEY, W. N., K.C.:

1. Question (No. 2) as to his employment by the T. & N.O. Railway Commission, or other Government Commission and amount paid for his services, 120.
2. Question (No. 3) as to payments to, for work as counsel to Hydro Inquiry Commission, 25.
3. Question (No. 6) as to whether he was retained by the Government in connection with the acquiring of the Abitibi Power Development and if so at what cost, 44.

TILLEY, JOHNSTON, THOMSON AND PARMENTER:

1. Question (No. 2) as to employment of, by T. & N.O. Railway Commission or other Government Commission and payment therefor, 120.

TILLEY, JOHNSTON, THOMSON AND PARMENTER—*Continued*

2. Question (No. 6) as to whether the firm or any member thereof was retained by the Government in connection with the acquirement of the Abitibi Power Development, 44.
3. Question (No. 115) as to whether they acted for the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in connection with the acquisition of the properties of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, 142.

TILLSONBURG, TOWN OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 29. Bill (No. 25) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 31. Reported, 148. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 172. Third reading, 180. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 102.)

TORONTO, CITY OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 28. Bill (No. 16) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported, 55. Second reading, 58. House in Committee, 62. Third reading, 79. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 103.)

TORONTO EAST GENERAL HOSPITAL:

Petition for an Act respecting, 15. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 64. Bill (No. 41) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 65. Reported and fees, less penalties and cost of printing, remitted, 91. Second reading, 98. House in Committee, 107. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 104.)

TORONTO GENERAL TRUSTS CORPORATION:

Petition *re* Act respecting Algoma Steel Corporation.

See *Algoma*.

TORONTO HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS:

Petition for an Act respecting, 24. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 38) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Reported, 65. Second reading, 73. House in Committee, 86. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 105.)

TORONTO, UNIVERSITY OF:

See *University*.

TRAFFIC, CENSUS OF:

Question (No. 23) as to cost to Government of taking census during fiscal years ending October 31st, in the years 1931 and 1932, 33.

TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY:

1. Question (No. 63) as to amount spent on, cost per mile and how much completed, 61.
2. Question (No. 119) as to relief expenditures on, 128.

TRENTON COLD STORAGE COMPANY, LIMITED:

Order for a Return showing all correspondence between the Government and the Company and particulars of any loan by the Government to the Company, etc., 98.

TRENTON MOVING PICTURE STUDIO:

Question (No. 140) as to number of employees at, cost to Government, etc., 180.

TRUCKERS:

Question (No. 122) as to whether any special licenses have been issued to, on behalf of the railways, etc., 180.

TRUCKS:

See *Automobiles*.

TRUSTS AND GUARANTEE COMPANY:

Petition *re* Act respecting Algoma Steel Corporation.

See *Algoma*.

UNEMPLOYED CAMPS:

Question (No. 80) as to employment in, of men from East Simcoe, 166.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF:

See *Relief*.

UNITED FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 28. Bill (No. 7) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Reported, 148. Second reading, 159. House in Committee, 172. Third reading, 179. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 78.)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO:

1. Question (No. 58) as to cost of new Botanical Building and new Conservatory, 52.
2. Question (No. 59) as to cost of building construction during each of the last five years, 53.
3. Report of Board of Governors, year ending June 30th, 1932, 14. (*Sessional Paper No. 12.*)

VEHICLE ACT, THE PUBLIC:

Bill (No. 150) to amend, introduced, 155. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 189. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 53.)

VEHICLE ACT, THE PUBLIC COMMERCIAL:

Bill (No. 151) to amend, introduced, 155. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 190. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 49.)

VETERINARY COLLEGE, THE ONTARIO:

Report of, for year 1932, 163. (*Sessional Paper No. 29.*)

VETERINARY SCIENCE PRACTICE ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 138) to amend, introduced, 149. Second reading, 169. House in Committee, 190. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 66.)

VITAL STATISTICS:

Report *re* registration of, for year ending December 31st, 1932, 197. (*Sessional Paper No. 13.*)

VITAL STATISTICS ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 96) to amend, introduced, 60. Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 90.

VOTERS' LISTS, PROVINCIAL:

1. Motion for appointment of a Select Committee to consider means of improving method of preparing, 26.
2. Committee appointed, 26.
3. Mr. Elliott (Bruce North) added, 66.
4. Granted leave to sit concurrently with the House, 164.
5. Report, 174.

VOTERS' LISTS ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 162) to amend, introduced, 175. Second reading, 186. House in Committee, 200. Third reading, 219. Royal Assent, 225. (23 George V, c. 67.)

WALDRON, GORDON:

1. Motion for a Select Committee to enquire into breach of privilege by, 93.
2. Motion withdrawn and new motion substituted, 93.
3. Report, 176.

WALKERVILLE, TOWN OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 24. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 64. Bill (No. 47) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 66. Reported, 118. Second reading, 125. House in Committee, 134. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 107.)

WAR MEMORIALS, ACT FOR PRESERVATION OF:

Bill (No. 85) introduced, 44. Lapsed.

WAYS AND MEANS, COMMITTEE ON:

1. Motion to go into, 86.
2. In the Committee, 213.
3. Report received and adopted, 213.

WELFARE, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC:

Report for last fiscal year, 196. (*Sessional Paper No. 19.*)

WELLAND, CITY OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 12. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 49. Bill (No. 35) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 50. Reported, 65. Second reading, 73. House in Committee, 86. Third reading, 92. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 108.)

WESTBURY, ERNEST:

Question (No. 106) as to whether he is in employment of Ontario Government, 89.

WESTERN SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION OF WINNIPEG:

Petition for an Act respecting, 15. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 19. Withdrawn, 149.

WESTON, TOWN OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 28. Bill (No. 21) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 30. Withdrawn, 149.

WHITBY, TOWN OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 11. Reported, 19. Bill (No. 28) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 20. Reported, 49. Second reading, 58. House in Committee, 62. Third reading, 79. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 109.)

WINDSOR, CITY OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 19. Bill (No. 12) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 20. Reported, 99. Second reading, 106. House in Committee, 112. Third reading, 115. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 110.)

WINDSOR, CITY OF, PUBLIC UTILITIES:

Petition for an Act respecting, 15. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 64. Bill (No. 40) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 65. Reported, 118. Second reading, 125. House in Committee, 134. Third reading, 150. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 110.)

WINDSOR, ESSEX AND LAKE SHORE ELECTRIC RAILWAY ASSOCIATION:

Petition for an Act respecting, 10. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 29. Bill (No. 13) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 31. Reported, 149. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 172. Third reading, 180. Royal Assent, 220. (23 George V, c. 111.)

WINE:

See *Liquor*.

WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT, THE DESERTED:

Bill (No. 59) to amend, introduced, 15. Second reading, 23. House in Committee, 42. Third reading, 114. Royal Assent, 222. (23 George V, c. 11.)

WOLF BOUNTY ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 149) to amend, introduced, 154. Second reading, 170. House in Committee, 189. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 224. (23 George V, c. 68.)

WOODMEN'S LIEN FOR WAGES ACT, THE:

Bill (No. 130) to amend, introduced, 135. Second reading and referred to Committee on Legal Bills, 159. Reported, 173. House in Committee 188. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 69.)

WOODSTOCK:

Question (No. 146) as to total sales from liquor store in, and cost of administration. Return ordered, 199.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, THE:

1. Bill (No. 120) to amend, introduced, 114. Second reading, 125. House in Committee, 134. Referred back to Committee, provisions of Bill (No. 128) added and reported, 216. Third reading, 218. Royal Assent, 223. (23 George V, c. 70.)
2. Bill (No. 121) to amend, introduced, 114. Second reading lost on Division, 146.
3. Bill (No. 128) to amend, introduced, 120. Second reading, 146. House in Committee, 171, 188. Added to Bill (No. 120), 216.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD:

1. Report for 1932, 173. (*Sessional Paper No. 28.*)
2. Question (No. 11) as to number of employees and wage bill last year, also particulars of contributions to group insurance, 122.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD—*Continued*

3. Question (No. 12) as to whether position of Chairman is full time or part time, 68.
4. Question (No. 105) as to payment of group insurance cost out of accident fund and how much was so used, 123.

YORK, TOWNSHIP OF:

Petition for an Act respecting, 16. Reported by Committee on Standing Orders, 48. Bill (No. 42) introduced and referred to Committee on Private Bills, 51. Reported, 149. Second reading, 160. House in Committee, 172. Third reading, 180. Royal Assent, 221. (23 George V, c. 112.)

YORK, EAST, TOWNSHIP OF:

See *East*.

YORK, WEST, ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF:

Report of by-election in, 5.

LIST OF SESSIONAL PAPERS, 1933

PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE DURING THE SESSION

TITLE	No.	REMARKS
Accounts, Public.....	1	<i>Printed.</i>
Agriculture, Department of (Minister), Report.....	21	<i>Printed.</i>
Agriculture, Department of (Statistics), Report.....	22	<i>Printed.</i>
Archives, Report.....	30	<i>Printed.</i>
Auditor's Report.....	27	<i>Printed.</i>
Civil Service Commissioner, Report.....	51	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Education, Orders-in-Council, Report.....	51	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Education, Report.....	11	<i>Printed.</i>
Elections, By, Records.....	25	<i>Printed.</i>
Estimates.....	2	<i>Printed.</i>
Game and Fisheries, Report.....	9	<i>Printed.</i>
Game Situation, Special Committee, Report.....	32	<i>Printed.</i>
Game and Fish Special Committee, Minutes, 1933.....	49	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Health, Department of, Report.....	14	<i>Printed.</i>
Health, Report of Registrar-General, Department of (Births, Marriages and Deaths).....	13	<i>Printed.</i>
Highways Improvement Fund.....	42	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Highways, Report.....	48	<i>Printed.</i>
Hospital, Penetanguishene, Construction of, Return.....	43	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Hospitals for Mentally Ill and Epileptic.....	15	<i>Printed.</i>
Hospitals and Sanatoria, Report.....	17	<i>Printed.</i>
Hydro-Electric Power Commission, Report.....	26	<i>Printed.</i>
Hydro-Electric Power Commission—Beauharnois Contract, Return.....	47	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Hydro-Electric Power Commission, Royal Commission, Report.....	34	<i>Printed.</i>
Insurance, Report.....	6	<i>Printed.</i>
Labour Department, Report.....	10	<i>Printed.</i>
Lands and Forests Department, Report.....	3	<i>Printed.</i>
Legal Offices, Report.....	5	<i>Printed.</i>
Liquor Control Board, Report.....	20	<i>Printed.</i>
Loan Corporations, Registrar of, Report.....	7	<i>Printed.</i>

TITLE	No.	REMARKS
Mines Department, Report.....	4	<i>Printed.</i>
Minimum Wage Board, Report.....	39	<i>Printed.</i>
Niagara Parks Commission, Report.....	52	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Northern Development Act, Orders-in-Council.....	36	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Northern Development and Colonization Roads Act, Report	44	<i>Printed.</i>
Ontario Athletic Commission, Report.....	16	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Ontario Historical Society, Report.....	38	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Ontario Municipal Board, Report.....	24	<i>Printed.</i>
Ontario Research Foundation, Report.....	46	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Ontario Veterinary College, Report.....	29	<i>Printed.</i>
Police Commissioner, Report.....	45	<i>Printed.</i>
Prisons and Reformatories, Report.....	18	<i>Printed.</i>
Public Welfare, Report.....	19	<i>Printed.</i>
Public Works, Report.....	8	<i>Printed.</i>
Royal Ontario Museum, Report.....	35	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Royal Ontario Museum, Return.....	40	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Rural, Public and Separate Schools, Grants to, Report....	37	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Secretary and Registrar, Report.....	50	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Statutes Distribution, Report.....	33	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Superannuation Fund, Report.....	41	<i>Not Printed.</i>
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, Report.....	23	<i>Printed.</i>
Toronto, University of, Report.....	12	<i>Printed.</i>
Workmen's Compensation Board, Report.....	28	<i>Printed.</i>

LIST OF SESSIONAL PAPERS

**Arranged in Numerical Order with their Titles at full length;
the name of the Member who moved the same, and
whether ordered to be printed or not.**

- | | |
|--------|---|
| No. 1 | Public Accounts of the Province of Ontario for the twelve months ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, March 23rd, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 2 | Estimates, Supplementary, for the Service of the Province for the year ending October 31st, 1933. Presented to the Legislature, March 23rd, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> Estimates for the year ending October 31st, 1934. Presented to the Legislature, April 10th, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 3 | Report of the Department of Lands and Forests, Ontario, for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 11th, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 4 | Annual Report of the Department of Mines, Ontario, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 5 | Report of the Inspector of Legal Offices for year ending December 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, March 22nd, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 6 | Report of the Superintendent of Insurance for year ending December 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 7 | Report of Registrar of Loan Corporations for Province of Ontario for year ending December 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 8 | Report of the Minister of Public Works and Labour, Ontario, for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, March 21st, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 9 | Report of the Department of Game and Fisheries, Ontario, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 10th, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 10 | Report of the Department of Labour, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, March 21st, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 11 | Report of the Department of Education, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 11th, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |
| No. 12 | Report of the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto for year ending 30th June, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, February 17th, 1933. <i>Printed.</i> |

- No. 13 Report relating to Registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths, Ontario, for year ending December 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 12th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 14 Annual Report of the Department of Health, Ontario, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 4th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 15 Annual Report upon Hospitals for Mentally Ill, Mentally Subnormal, and Epileptic for period ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 16 Annual Report of the Ontario Athletic Commission for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, March 30th, 1933. *Not Printed.*
- No. 17 Annual Report of the Hospitals and Sanatoria of Ontario for year ending September 30th, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 18 Report of the Prisons and Reformatories of the Province of Ontario for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 11th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 19 Report of the Department of Public Welfare, Province of Ontario, for year 1931-32. Presented to the Legislature, April 12th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 20 Report of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario as at October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, March 1st, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 21 Report of the Department of Agriculture, Ontario, for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 22 Report of the Statistics Branch, Ontario Department of Agriculture, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 23 Report of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, February 17th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 24 Annual Report of the Ontario Municipal Board for year ending December 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 4th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 25 Return from the Records of the By-election to the Legislative Assembly held on the 17th and 28th days of May, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, February 15th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 26 Report of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 12th, 1933. *Printed.*

- No. 27 Report of the Provincial Auditor, Ontario, 1931-1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 28 Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 10th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 29 Report of the Ontario Veterinary College for year 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 30 Report of Department of Public Records and Archives, Ontario, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, February 17th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 31 Regulations and Orders-in-Council made under the authority of the Department of Education Act or of the Acts relating to Public Schools, Separate Schools or High Schools. Presented to the Legislature, February 17th, 1933. *Not printed.*
- No. 32 Report of the Special Committee on the Game Situation, 1931-1933. Presented to the Legislature, March 10th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 33 Report on Distribution of Revised Statutes and Sessional Papers. Presented to the Legislature, February 17th, 1933. *Not Printed.*
- No. 34 Report of Royal Commission appointed to Inquire into Certain Matters Concerning the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario. Presented to the Legislature, February 17th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 35 Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for Royal Ontario Museum for year ending June 30th, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, February 17th, 1933. *Not Printed.*
- No. 36 Orders-in-Council made under the authority of The Northern Development Act, 1929. Presented to the Legislature, February 28th, 1933. *Not Printed.*
- No. 37 Comparative Statement of Legislative Grants apportioned to Rural, Public and Separate Schools in the Counties and Districts for year 1932. Presented to the Legislature, February 28th, 1933. *Not Printed*
- No. 38 Report of the Ontario Historical Society for the year 1932. Presented to the Legislature, February 28th, 1933. *Not Printed.*
- No. 39 Annual Report of the Minimum Wage Board, Ontario, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, February 28th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 40 Return to an Order of the House dated March 8th, 1933, That there be laid before the House a Return showing: 1. What is the total cost to date of the new wing of the Royal Ontario Museum. 2. Who was the contractor. 3. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer. 4. What other companies tendered. 5. What was the amount in each case. 6. What amount was allowed for extras above the contract price. *Mr. Blakelock.* Presented to the Legislature, March 9th, 1933. *Not Printed.*

- No. 41 Report of the Public Service Superannuation Board, Ontario, for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, March 20th, 1933. *Not Printed.*
- No. 42 Statement showing all sums credited to The Highway Improvement Fund and all sums chargeable thereto for the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, March 20th, 1933. *Not Printed.*
- No. 43 Return to an Order dated 17th March, 1933, That there be laid before this House a Return showing the following information: 1. Were tenders called for the construction of the Criminal Insane Hospital at Penetang. 2. If so, what firms tendered on the work. 3. What were the prices received from each firm. 4. Who received the contract for the construction of the building. 5. What was the price of said tender. 6. Was the building erected on the original plans and specifications. 7. Who was the inspector who supervised the construction of the Hospital for Criminal Insane at Penetang. 8. What remuneration was he paid. 9. Was the brickwork of said building carried to the height provided in the specification and plans. 10. If no, why not. 11. Were tenders asked for separately for (1) heating, (2) plumbing for the Hospital for the Criminal Insane at Penetang. 12. What firms tendered and what were the amounts of each tender. 13. What extra charges were made by, and allowed to, firms who received the contracts. 14. Were repairs required to be done or alterations made on the plumbing or heating after the same had been accepted by the Government from the contractor. 15. If so, who did it. 16. What was the cost of such repairs and alterations. *Mr. Simpson.* Presented to the Legislature, March 20th, 1933. *Not Printed.*
- No. 44 Report on operations under The Northern Development Act and The Colonization Roads Act for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, March 22nd, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 45 Report of the Commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, March 27th, 1933. *Printed.*
- No. 46 Report of the Ontario Research Foundation—on a Technical and Economic Investigation of Northern Ontario Lignite. Presented to the Legislature, April 5th, 1933. *Not Printed.*
- No. 47 Return to an Order of the House, 1932, That there be laid before this House a Return showing: 1. The contract made between the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and the Beauharnois Power Company, November, 1929, for 250,000 h.p. 2. Order-in-Council confirming this contract. 3. Copies of all correspondence pertaining thereto. 287. *Mr. Slack.* Presented to the Legislature, April 5th, 1933. *Not Printed.*
- No. 48 Annual Report of Department of Highways, Ontario. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. *Printed.*

No. 49	Minutes of Meetings of Special Committee of the Legislature on Game and Fish, February-March, 1933. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. <i>Not Printed</i>
No. 50	Report of the Secretary and Registrar of the Province of Ontario with respect to the Administration of The Companies Act, The Extra Provincial Corporation Act, The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, and The Companies Information Act for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. <i>Not Printed.</i>
No. 51	Report of the Civil Service Commissioner of Ontario for year ending October 31st, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 7th, 1933. <i>Not Printed.</i>
No. 52	Report of the Niagara Parks Commission, 1932. Presented to the Legislature, April 12th, 1933. <i>Not Printed.</i>

RETURNS ORDERED BUT NOT BROUGHT DOWN

1. Showing: 1. Copies of all correspondence relating to agreements between the Government and the Trenton Cold Storage Company, Limited. 2. Full particulars regarding any loan of money made by the Government to the Trenton Cold Storage Company, Limited. 3. Full particulars relating to any lease of space by the Government from the Trenton Cold Storage Company, Limited.
2. Showing: 1. (a) How many automobiles, trucks and motorcycles were owned by the Ontario Government in each of the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive. (b) What was the total cost of maintenance and operation in each of the above years. 2. (a) How many automobiles, trucks and motorcycles were given mileage and other allowances by the Ontario Government during the above years. (b) What was the cost during these years.
3. Showing: 1. What is the total amount in arrears to the Agricultural Development Board. 2. How many individual farmers owe this amount. 3. How many have been in arrears for two years, what amount. 4. How many have been in arrears for more than two years. What amount.
4. Showing: 1. What is the total sum of money paid to the firm of Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle & Nash, Accountants, or to any member or employee of the firm during each of the last three fiscal years by (a) the Government; (b) Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario; (c) any other outside public service department of the Government.
5. Showing: 1. To whom has the Ontario Liquor Control Board allotted (a) Brewers' Warehouse Licenses in Toronto, Ottawa, London, Windsor, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Niagara Falls, Brantford, Chatham, St. Thomas, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, North Bay, Fort William, Port Arthur, Walkerville, Oshawa, Brockville and East Windsor. (b) Who

- owns each warehouse. 2. Do the breweries pay fees to the licensees in order (a) to have their beer sold through the warehouses. (b) If so, how much are the fees paid. (c) Who receives these fees, the Ontario Liquor Control Board, or the licensee. 3. How much does each licensee receive per case on all beer sold through his warehouse, and to whom does this money go. 4. Do the Brewers pay the cost or percentage of cost of operating these warehouses. 5. (a) Who appoints the staffs of these warehouses. (b) Who sets their rate of pay, and who pays them. (c) What is the average wage paid in each of the warehouses named in No. 1.
6. Showing: 1. What was the cost of the Ontario Government Garage in the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive. 2. How many new trucks, motorcycles and automobiles were purchased during the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive. 3. What was the cost of each automobile purchased during the years 1929-1932, inclusive.
7. Showing what is the amount in each of the years 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932, by which totals of Revenue and Expenditure are reduced by the adoption of the new system of bookkeeping by which cross entries are eliminated.
8. Showing: 1. From what firms or individuals in Scotland did the Ontario Liquor Control Board buy whiskey or other supplies during the last fiscal year. 2. What was the amount and value of the business done with each firm or individual. 3. Who was the Ontario representative in each instance and what commissions did each Canadian representative receive. 4. (a) What were the gross sales from the following liquor stores during the last fiscal year: Woodstock, Brantford, Paris. (b) What was the total cost of local administration in each instance.
9. Showing: 1. What fees or remunerations were paid in connection with the sale of law stamps during the years 1930 and 1931, giving names and addresses and occupations of recipients, and amounts paid to each recipient. 2. What services do such persons render to entitle them to such fees or remuneration.
10. A return of all agreements and contracts entered into between the Ontario Power Service Corporation, Limited, and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for the acquisition by the Commission of the assets of the Corporation and the debentures of the same, and also all correspondence in connection with the same, passing from or to (1) the Government of the Province of Ontario, (2) the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, and (3) the Ontario Power Service Corporation, Limited, and also all memorandums, reports, proposals, advertisements, papers and documents of any kind, or copies thereof, in any way relating to such acquisition or in any way relating to or connected with the preliminary negotiations leading to such negotiations commenced, in the possession or power of any of the said three above-mentioned parties or of their solicitors, agents or trustees, and also showing the names of all holders of bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation who deposited their bonds as a part of such acquisition of the assets of the Corporation.

JOURNALS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

OF THE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15TH, 1933

PROCLAMATION

H. A. BRUCE

CANADA.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

GEORGE THE FIFTH, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, KING, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

To Our Faithful, the Members elected to serve in the Legislative Assembly of our Province of Ontario, and to every of you—GREETING.

WILLIAM H. PRICE, *Attorney-General.* { **W**HEREAS it is expedient for certain causes and considerations to convene the Legislative Assembly of Our said Province, WE DO WILL that you and each of you and all others in this behalf interested, on WEDNESDAY, the Fifteenth day of February now next, at OUR CITY OF TORONTO, personally be and appear for the DESPATCH OF BUSINESS, to treat, act, do and conclude upon those things which, in Our Legislature of the Province of Ontario, by the Common Council of Our said Province, may by the favour of God be ordained. HEREIN FAIL NOT.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent, and the GREAT SEAL of Our Province of Ontario to be hereunto affixed.

WITNESS, The Honourable HERBERT ALEXANDER BRUCE, a Colonel in Our Royal Army Medical Corps, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, etc., Lieutenant-Governor of Our Province of Ontario, at Our Government House in Our City of Toronto, in Our said Province, this Tenth day of January, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three and in the twenty-third year of Our Reign.

By Command,

C. F. BULMER,
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Wednesday, the Fifteenth day of February, 1933, being the first day of the Fourth Meeting of the Eighteenth Legislature of the Province of Ontario for the despatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of The Honourable Herbert Alexander Bruce, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met,

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor then entered the House and being seated on the Throne was pleased to open the Session by the following gracious speech:—

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly:

In welcoming you to the discharge of your legislative duties, I avail myself of this early opportunity to extend cordial greetings to the Members of this House, and to the citizens generally, as Lieutenant-Governor of this Province.

As a people we unite in rendering thanks to Almighty God for the benefits of the past year, and for the hope of Divine favour in the future.

I desire to pay respectful tribute to the conscientious services of The Honourable William Donald Ross, as Lieutenant-Governor, and The Right Honourable Sir William Mulock, as Administrator, and at the same time to tender to both these distinguished gentlemen the grateful acknowledgments of our people.

My Ministers lately participated in the Conference between the Federal and the various provincial governments on a number of subjects of common interest. Much consideration was given to unemployment insurance, and the plans for

providing and distributing funds for direct relief at the present time. Existing duplications of public services and instances of overlapping legislation were discussed, and progress was made towards an understanding from which, after further investigation, definite results may be expected.

An agreement has been reached between the Federal authorities and this Government concerning the development of the water powers of the international section of the St. Lawrence River. Upon the ratification of the seaway treaty between the United States and Canada you will be afforded an opportunity of pronouncing upon the proposed development.

One of the outstanding achievements of the Province during the past year was the completion of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway to James Bay. The event opens fresh avenues for the progress of Ontario, with a wide range of attractive possibilities. The new terminus at Moosonee is destined to become an important distributing centre.

As a people we have a deep interest in the progress and development of Northern Ontario because of the opportunities they offer for enterprise and individual effort, and for their bearing upon the general prosperity of the Province. The vital importance of cheap and abundant electric power prompted the recent purchase of the Abitibi Canyon Power Project by means of which industry and mining in the North Country will be placed in an exceptionally favourable position.

A close scrutiny of the proposed expenditures for the current year has been in progress during the past few weeks by the recently appointed Budget Committee. It is expected that the economies recommended by the Committee, in addition to the retrenchment effected during the past fiscal year, will improve materially the financial outlook of the Province.

Circumstances are directing public and expert attention to the study and consideration of the prevailing rates of interest, as well as the importance of their relation to the economic and domestic life of the community.

It is a matter of much concern that extremely low prices continue to hamper the agricultural industry, a situation which was further complicated by the forced departure of Great Britain from the gold standard. The prospect of an early return to better conditions is improved by the outcome of the Imperial Economic Conference and by the energetic work of the Marketing Board, coupled with the plans for an intensive drive for British and Canadian markets. Further results are anticipated from a definite effort to stimulate the consumption of Ontario's products by our own people.

During the past year the Hydro-Electric Power Commission met all its financial obligations, and further increased its reserves which now amount to some \$62,500,000. The fact that this was possible under existing circumstances, and that the bonds of the Commission rank among the premier securities of the Dominion, materially enhance the public credit.

Certain contracts entered into by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission were referred to a judicial commission of inquiry. After an exhaustive investigation, findings were arrived at, which were made public, and will be laid on the Table of this House.

The results of gold mining have placed Ontario in an enviable position, and helped the Province to sustain the credit of the Dominion. All indications point to further expansion of gold production in this Province.

Last year provincial subsidies on County and Township roads amounted to \$5,547,739.00, and on our King's Highway system there was expended \$7,705,649.00 for construction and maintenance.

Throughout the Province, the schools have been maintained with courage and sacrifice by the ratepayers, assisted by the Government as generously as present conditions permit. Legislation will be proposed to lighten the burden of taxation to local taxpayers, without impairing the efficiency of the system.

In the improvement of plans for direct relief, my Ministers enlisted the assistance of an Advisory Committee composed of representative citizens from various sections of the Province. The valuable report submitted by it provides the basis of the administration of the relief funds. The community is greatly indebted to the public-spirited citizens who have given gratuitously of their time and energies to the solution of the pressing problems of this period.

By the establishment of a plant for the development of radium products at the University of Toronto, one of the important recommendations of the Cancer Commission has been brought into operation, and the distribution of radium emanations has been already commenced.

A measure will be submitted to you to readjust the representation of the people in this House with a view of removing existing inequalities as revealed by the recent census. In this connection you will be asked to approve of a reduction in the membership of the Legislative Assembly.

Legislation will be introduced to afford further relief to mortgagors, particularly to those who are home owners; other measures have been prepared to make amendments to the statutory law in conformity with experience and changing conditions.

The Public Accounts have been prepared and will be submitted to you at an early date. Estimates of expenditures for the current and ensuing fiscal years are in an advanced state of preparation.

In conclusion, I invite your earnest attention to the public business, and trust that your labours will advance the welfare of all classes and improve the conditions of the people.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to retire.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker then reported,

That, to prevent mistakes, he had obtained a copy of His Honour's Speech, which he read.

Mr. Speaker informed the House,

That the Clerk had received, from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and laid upon the Table, the following certificate of the election held since the last Session of the House:—

Electoral District of York, West—Mr. Harry I. Price.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that in virtue of a Writ of Election, dated the Sixteenth day of April, 1932, issued by the Honourable the Administrator of the Government, and addressed to Robert Wallace, Esquire, Returning Officer for the Electoral District of West York, for the election of a Member to represent the said Electoral District of West York in the Legislative Assembly of this Province, in the room of the Honourable Forbes E. Godfrey, who, since his election as representative of the said Electoral District of West York, has departed this life, Henry I. Price, Esquire, has been returned as duly elected, as appears by the Return of the said Writ of Election, dated the Sixteenth day of June, 1932, which is now lodged of record in my office.

C. F. BULMER,
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Toronto, February 13th, 1933.

Mr. Speaker also informed the House that the Clerk had laid upon the Table:—

A Return from the Records of the By-Election to the Legislative Assembly held on the 17th and 28th days of May, 1932, showing:—

(1) The number of votes polled for each Candidate; (2) The majority whereby the successful Candidate was returned; (3) The total number of votes polled; (4) The number of votes remaining unpolled; (5) The number of names on the Polling Lists; (6) The number of ballot papers sent out to each polling

place; (7) The used ballot papers; (8) The unused ballot papers; (9) The rejected ballot papers; (10) The cancelled ballot papers; (11) The declined ballot papers; (12) The ballot papers taken from polling places; (13) The number of printed ballots not distributed to D.R.O.'s, and the number of ballot papers printed. (*Sessional Paper No. 25.*)

Harry I. Price, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of West York, having taken the Oath and subscribed the Roll, took his Seat.

On motion of Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Price,

A Bill was introduced intituled "An Act respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office to persons appointed as Justices of the Peace," and the same was read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Price,

Ordered, That the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor to this House be taken into consideration To-morrow.

On motion of Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Price,

Resolved, That Select Standing Committees of this House, for the present Session, be appointed for the following purposes—1. On Privileges and Elections; 2. On Railways; 3. On Miscellaneous Private Bills; 4. On Standing Orders; 5. On Public Accounts; 6. On Printing; 7. On Municipal Law; 8. On Legal Bills; 9. On Agriculture and Colonization; 10. On Fish and Game; 11. On Labour; which said Committees shall severally be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as shall be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

The House then adjourned at 3.30 p.m.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Black, the Petition of the Mutual Relief Insurance Company.

By Mr. Jutten, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Hamilton.

By Mr. Cote, the Petition of St. Patricks Asylum of Ottawa; also, the Petition of Les Révérends Pères Oblats de L'Immaculée Conception de Marie; also, the Petition of the College of Ottawa.

By Mr. Hogarth, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Port Arthur.

By Mr. Ellis, the Petition of the Central Canada Exhibition Association; also, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Ottawa; also, the Petition of the Protestant Children's Village of Ottawa.

By Mr. Oliver, the Petition of the United Farmers Co-operative Association.

By Mr. Stedman, the Petition of the Townships of Drummond, North Elmsley, Beckwith and Montague.

By Mr. Graves, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Niagara; also, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of St. Catharines.

By Mr. Wilson (Windsor), the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Windsor; also, the Petition of the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

By Mr. Smith (Essex South), the Petition of the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Electric Railway Association.

By Mr. Reid, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Sandwich.

By Mr. Oakley, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Toronto; also, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Village of Forest Hill; also, the Petition of James Grant, William A. Patterson, *et al.*

By Mr. McNaughton, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Cornwall.

By Mr. Lyons, the Petition of the Toronto General Trust Company and the Trusts and Guarantee Company.

By Mr. Price (York West), the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Weston.

By Mr. Case, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of East York.

By Mr. Baxter, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Tillsonburg.

By Mr. Skinner, the Petition of Arthur Cyril Boyce, Harold Mackinlay Code, George B. Acheson, *et al.*

By Mr. Sinclair, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Whitby.

By Mr. Hutchinson, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Kenora.

By Mr. Baird, the Petition of Havergal College.

By Mr. Strickland, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Peterborough.

By Mr. Vaughan, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Welland.

By Mr. Willson (Niagara Falls), the Petition of the Trustees of the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust.

By Mr. Moore, the Petition of the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London; also, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of London.

The Order of the Day for the Consideration of the Speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session having been read,

Mr. Price (York West) moved, seconded by Mr. Burt,

That an humble Address be presented to The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:—

To The Honourable Herbert Alexander Bruce, a Colonel in the Royal Army Medical Corps, F.R.C.S. (Eng.), Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario.

We, His Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

And a Debate having ensued, it was, on the motion of Mr. Sinclair,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

On motion by Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Finlayson,

Ordered, That a Select Committee of ten Members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, a list of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by this House, to be composed as follows:—

Messrs. Henry (York East), Price (Parkdale), Kennedy (Peel), Cote, Ireland, Mahony, McQuibban, Oakley, Robertson and Nixon.

The House then adjourned at 4.15 p.m.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Murphy (St. Patrick), the Petition of the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Diocese of Toronto.

By Mr. Heighington, the Petition of the Western Savings and Loan Association of Winnipeg.

By Mr. Reid, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Windsor; also, the Petition of the Canadian Transit Company and the Detroit International Bridge Company.

By Mr. Oakley, the Petition of the Toronto East General Hospital.

The following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the Mutual Relief Life Insurance Company, praying that an Act may pass to amend 19 Geo. V, cap. 132, An Act respecting the Oddfellows Relief Association of Canada for the purpose of altering the basis of valuation of contracts of the Mutual Relief Life Insurance Company issued prior to the 10th day of June, 1929.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Hamilton, praying that an Act may pass validating a debenture by-law of \$300,000.00 and authorizing the issue of debentures for \$652,000.00 for certain purposes.

Of St. Patricks Asylum of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass to change the official name of the petitioners to St. Patricks Home.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Port Arthur, praying that an Act may pass to alter the terms of certain debenture by-laws, to authorize the issue of certain debentures, and for other purposes.

Of the Central Canada Exhibition Association, praying that an Act may pass to amend the Act of incorporation of the petitioners and to provide for certain changes in its membership.

Of the United Farmers Co-operative Association, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the name of the Company, changes in the authorized capital stock of the company and for other purposes.

Of the Trustees of the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust, praying that an Act may pass incorporating the petitioners as a Hospital Trust according to law.

Of the Townships of Drummond, North Elmsley, Beckwith and Montague, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a diversion in the method of using a Government grant to the Black Creek drainage scheme.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Niagara, praying that an Act may pass to authorize and confirm a certain local improvement by-law and to authorize the issue of debentures to the amount of \$4,500.00.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Windsor, praying that an Act may pass validating and confirming By-law No. 3780 of the petitioning corporation and an agreement made with the Detroit and Windsor Subway Company under the terms thereof.

Of the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Electric Railway Association, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the petitioners to issue bonds for the purpose of replacing an existing bond issue.

Of the Essex Border Utilities Commission, praying that an Act may pass to provide that the Act governing the Commission shall not apply to the Township of Sandwich South and to provide that Part VI of The Ontario Municipal Board Act shall apply to the Commission.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Sandwich, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a decrease in the size of the Town Council.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass to validate debentures and expenditures amounting to \$169,250.00 and for other purposes.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Cornwall, praying that an Act may pass to validate By-law No. 26 of the said town and the issue of debentures to the amount of \$49,337.15 thereunder.

Of the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London, praying that an Act may pass to define and extend the powers of the petitioners to hold, hypothecate, mortgage and otherwise deal in real estate and other securities.

Of the Toronto General Trust Company and the Trusts and Guarantee Company, praying that an Act may pass to validate certain mortgages made by the Algoma Steel Corporation which are held by the petitioners.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Weston, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the date of holding municipal elections in the petitioning municipality, a change in the method of levying income tax and for other purposes.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Village of Forest Hill, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the method of making assessments for income taxation and for other purposes.

Of James Grant, William A. Patterson, *et al*, praying that an Act may pass separating a portion of the Township of Scarborough and constituting it a new township to be known as North Scarborough.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of East York, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the petitioners to enter into possession of lands in arrears of taxes without the formality of a tax sale, to authorize an annual salary for members of the Township Council and for other purposes.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Tillsonburg, praying that an Act may pass ratifying an agreement made by the petitioners to guarantee the bonds of the Tillsonburg Shoe Company to the amount of \$40,000.00.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of London, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the rental by the petitioners of spaces on the boulevards in London for commercial purposes, to validate tax sales and for other purposes.

Of Arthur Cyril Boyce, Harold Mackinlay Code, George B. Acheson, *et al*, praying that an Act may pass incorporating the petitioners as the Thousand Island Bridge Company with authority to construct a toll bridge connecting Hill Island with the mainland.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Whitby, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the annexation to the Town of Whitby of Township Lot No. 30 in the Broken Front of the Township of Whitby.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Kenora, praying that an Act may pass to validate tax sales, to authorize debentures of the value of \$40,808.97, and for other purposes.

Of Havergal College, praying that an Act may pass amending the Act of Incorporation of the petitioners so as to alter the terms of appointment and service of the directors.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Peterborough, praying that an Act may pass altering the law regarding nomination for the position of Mayor in the said city, so that a sitting Alderman must resign his seat in the Council at least five days before the date of the civic nominations if he desires to be a candidate for the office of Mayor.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass to authorize debenture by-laws totalling \$240,000.00, and for other purposes.

Of Les Révérends Pères Oblats de L'Immaculée Conception de Marie, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the name of the petitioning body, and a definition of the rights of the petitioners to acquire and hold real estate.

Of the College of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the name of the petitioning body, to consolidate former Acts and to define the powers and duties of its governing bodies.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Welland, praying that an Act may pass validating By-law No. 827 of the petitioners and ratifying an agreement with the Empire Cotton Mills Company Limited providing for a fixed assessment of the Company's assets.

Of the Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass declaring that the petitioners are entitled to any charitable bequests and devises heretofore or hereafter made in favour of the Ottawa Protestant Infants Home.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of St. Catharines, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the petitioners to establish a fund to be known as the Workmen's Compensation Fund, to increase the membership of the Public Utilities Commission of St. Catharines from three to five, and for other purposes.

Mr. Kennedy (Peel) presented the first report of the Select Committee appointed to strike the Standing Committees of the House which was read as follows, and adopted:—

Your Committee recommends that the Standing Committee on Standing Orders be composed as follows:—

Messrs. Aubin, Berry, Blanchard, Burt, Craig, Davis, Ecclestone, Elliott (Rainy River), Freele, Harrison, Henry (East Kent), Hipel, Jamieson, Kennedy (Temiskaming), Laughton, Martin (Brantford), Medd, McArthur, McBrien, McLean, McMillen, McNaughton, Newman, Raven, Richardson, Ross, Sinclair,

Skinner, Smith (Greenwood), Staples, Strickland, St. Denis, Taylor, Tweed, Vaughan, Willson (Niagara Falls), Wilson (Lincoln), Wright—38.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of seven Members.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to act with Mr. Speaker in the control and management of the Library, to be composed as follows:—

Messrs. Bragg, Harrison, Moore, McNaughton, Price (Parkdale), Richardson, Shields and Taylor.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to direct the expenditure of any sum set apart by the Estimates for Art Purposes to be composed as follows:—

Messrs. Baird, Baxter, Challies, Clark, Kennedy (Peel), Honeywell, Monteith, Newman and Nixon.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 55), intituled "An Act to amend The Mining Act." *Mr. McCrea.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 56), intituled "An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act." *Mr. Price.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 57), intituled "An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act." *Mr. Price.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 58), intituled "An Act to amend The Execution Act." *Mr. Kennedy.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of Royal Ontario Museum for year ending June 30th, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 35.*)

Also, Report of Royal Commission appointed to Inquire into Certain Matters Concerning The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario. (*Sessional Papers No. 34.*)

Also, Report on Distribution of Revised Statutes and Sessional Papers. (*Sessional Papers No. 33.*)

Also, Report of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 23.*)

Also, Report of Department of Public Records and Archives, Ontario. 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 30.*)

Also, Regulations and Orders-in-Council made under the authority of The Department of Education Act or of the Acts relating to Public Schools, Separate Schools or High Schools. (*Sessional Papers No. 31.*)

Also, Report of the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto for year ending 30th June, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 12.*)

The House then adjourned at 3.20 p.m.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3.30 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Price (West York), the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of York; also, the Petition of the Ferranti Electric, Limited.

By Mr. Kenning, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of Teck.

By Mr. Honeywell, the Petition of the Ontario Master Barbers' and Hairdressers' Association.

The following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Diocese of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass enlarging the powers of the petitioners in respect to holding, mortgaging or otherwise dealing in lands.

Of the Canadian Transit Company and the Detroit International Bridge Company, praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement made between the petitioners and the Town of Sandwich respecting a fixed assessment on the assets of the petitioners.

Of the Western Savings and Loan Association of Winnipeg, praying that an Act may pass incorporating the company under The Ontario Companies Act.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Windsor, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the petitioners without taking a vote of the people to establish a Public Utilities Commission to administer its various public utilities.

Of the Toronto East General Hospital, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm an agreement under which the Toronto Orthopedic Hospital became amalgamated with the petitioners.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 59), intituled "An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 60), intituled "An Act respecting Collection Agencies." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 61), intituled "An Act to Conserve and Improve the Valley of the Don River." *Mr. Heighington*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of Teck, praying that an Act may pass validating debenture by-laws to the value of \$64,600.00 and to validate tax sales.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of York, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the formation of a Board of Education for the Township, to validate a debenture by-law for \$10,000.00 and for other purposes.

Of the Ferranti Electric, Limited, praying that an Act may pass validating a by-law of the Township of York, for the purpose of fixing, for a period of ten years, the Township assessment on the property of the petitioners.

Of the Ontario Master Barbers' and Hairdressers' Association, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the establishment of a Board of Governors to control and regulate the practice of barbering or hairdressing in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Kennedy (Peel) from the Select Committee appointed to strike the Standing Committees of the House presented their Second Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee recommends that the Standing Committees of the House as listed hereunder be composed as follows:—

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Honourable Mr. Henry, Messrs. Aubin, Berry, Blakelock, Blanchard, Bragg, Burt, Calder, Case, Challies, Clark, Cote, Craig, Dunlop, Fraleigh, Freele, Henry (East Kent), Ireland, Jutten, McCrea, Murphy (St. Patrick), Newman, Nesbitt, Oakley, Oliver, Price (Parkdale), Richardson, Sanderson, Sangster, Scholfield, Shaver, Shields, Sinclair, Singer, St. Denis, Strickland, Taylor, Wilson (Lincoln)
—38.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS

Honourable Mr. Henry, Messrs. Blanchard, Calder, Challies, Clark, Cooke, Craig, Davis, Dunlop, Elliot (Rainy River), Ellis, Fraleigh, Freele, Graham, Graves, Hambly, Harcourt, Hipel, Hutchinson, Ireland, Jutten, Kennedy (Temiskaming), Kenning, Laughton, Lyons, Macaulay, Mackay, Mahony, Martin

(Hamilton), *Martin* (Brantford), *Medd*, *Monteith*, *Murphy* (Beaches), *Murray*, *McArthur*, *McBrien*, *McCrea*, *McLean*, *Nesbitt*, *Oakley*, *Poisson*, *Price* (Parkdale), *Reid*, *Richardson*, *Ross*, *St. Denis*, *Scholfield*, *Shields*, *Sinclair*, *Smith* (Toronto), *Taylor*, *Waters*, *Wilson* (London), *Wright*—54.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS

Honourable Mr. Henry, *Messrs. Acres*, *Blakelock*, *Baird*, *Baxter*, *Berry*, *Black*, *Blanchard*, *Bragg*, *Calder*, *Case*, *Challies*, *Clark*, *Colliver*, *Cooke*, *Cote*, *Ecclestone*, *Elliott* (Bruce), *Ellis*, *Finlayson*, *Graves*, *Harcourt*, *Harrison*, *Heighington*, *Hill*, *Hipel*, *Hogarth*, *Honeywell*, *Ireland*, *Jamieson*, *Jutten*, *Kennedy* (Peel), *Kenning*, *Macaulay*, *Mahony*, *Martin* (Hamilton), *Martin* (Brantford), *Morrison*, *Moore*, *Munro*, *Murphy* (Beaches), *McArthur*, *McBrien*, *McCrea*, *McNaughton*, *McMillen*, *McQuibban*, *Newman*, *Nesbitt*, *Nixon*, *Oakley*, *Oliver*, *Price* (Parkdale), *Price* (West York), *Poisson*, *Raven*, *Reid*, *Robb*, *Robertson*, *Scholfield*, *Seguin*, *Shaver*, *Shields*, *Simpson*, *Sinclair*, *Singer*, *Skinner*, *Slack*, *Smith* (Essex), *Smith* (Toronto), *Spence*, *Staples*, *Stedman*, *Strickland*, *Taylor*, *Tweed*, *Vaughan*, *Waters*, *Willson* (Niagara), *Wilson* (Windsor), *Wright*—81.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Honourable Mr. Henry, *Messrs. Acres*, *Baird*, *Berry*, *Black*, *Blanchard*, *Bragg*, *Burt*, *Calder*, *Case*, *Colliver*, *Cote*, *Craig*, *Dunlop*, *Ecclestone*, *Elliott* (Bruce), *Ellis*, *Finlayson*, *Fraleigh*, *Freele*, *Harcourt*, *Heighington*, *Hill*, *Hipel*, *Honeywell*, *Hutchinson*, *Ireland*, *Jamieson*, *Jutten*, *Kennedy* (Peel), *Kenning*, *Lancaster*, *Lyons*, *Macaulay*, *MacKay*, *Martin* (Hamilton), *Martin* (Brantford), *Monteith*, *Moore*, *Morrison*, *Munro*, *Murphy* (Beaches), *Murphy* (St. Patrick), *Murray*, *McBrien*, *McCrea*, *McLean*, *McNaughton*, *McQuibban*, *Nesbitt*, *Newman*, *Nixon*, *Oakley*, *Oliver*, *Price* (Parkdale), *Price* (West York), *Reid*, *Robb*, *Robertson*, *St. Denis*, *Sangster*, *Seguin*, *Shaver*, *Simpson*, *Sinclair*, *Singer*, *Skinner*, *Slack*, *Smith* (Essex), *Smith* (Toronto), *Strickland*, *Tweed*, *Willson* (Niagara Falls), *Wilson* (Windsor)—74.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Honourable Mr. Henry, *Messrs. Aubin*, *Blanchard*, *Colliver*, *Elliott* (Rainy River), *Hambly*, *Lancaster*, *Martin* (Hamilton), *Medd*, *Monteith*, *McArthur*, *McNaughton*, *McQuibban*, *Robertson*, *Simpson*, *Sinclair*, *Singer*, *Spence*, *Stedman*, *Tweed*, *Waters*, *Wright*—22.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of five Members.

COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL LAW

Honourable Mr. Henry, *Messrs. Acres*, *Baird*, *Baxter*, *Bell*, *Case*, *Challies*, *Clark*, *Colliver*, *Cooke*, *Cote*, *Craig*, *Davis*, *Dunlop*, *Ecclestone*, *Elliott* (Bruce),

Elliott (Rainy River), Ellis, Finlayson, Graham, Graves, Hambly, Heighington, Henry (Kent), Hill, Honeywell, Hutchinson, Ireland, Jamieson, Jutten, Kennedy (Peel), Kennedy (Temiskaming), Lancaster, Laughton, Lyons, Macaulay, Mackay, Mahony, Medd, Monteith, Morrison, Munro, Murphy (Beaches), Murphy (St. Patrick), Murray, McArthur, McBrien, McCrea, McLean, Nesbitt, Oakley, Poisson, Price (Parkdale), Price (West York), Raven, Reid, Richardson, Robb, Robertson, Ross, Sanderson, Sangster, Scholfield, Seguin, Shaver, Shields, Sinclair, Skinner, Slack, Smith (Essex), Smith (Toronto), Staples, Stedman, Vaughan, Wilson (London), Wilson (Windsor), Wright—77.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON LEGAL BILLS

Honourable Mr. Henry, Messrs. Baird, Cote, Ellis, Finlayson, Heighington, Honeywell, Hutchinson, Macaulay, Martin (Hamilton), Moore, Morrison, McBrien, McCrea, Murphy (St. Patrick), Nesbitt, Nixon, Price, Seguin, Simpson, Sinclair, Singer, Smith (South Essex), Slack, Tweed, Wilson (Windsor)—26.

The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of five Members.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Honourable Mr. Henry, Messrs. Acres, Baxter, Bell, Black, Blanchard, Blakelock, Bragg, Burt, Calder, Challies, Cooke, Colliver, Craig, Davis, Ecclestone, Elliott (Bruce), Fraleigh, Freele, Graham, Harcourt, Harrison, Henry (Kent), Hill, Hogarth, Hutchinson, Ireland, Jamieson, Kennedy (Peel), Kennedy (Temiskaming), Lancaster, Laughton, Lyons, Mackay, Mahony, Murray, McLean, McMillen, McNaughton, McQuibban, Newman, Oliver, Poisson, Richardson, Raven, Robb, Ross, St. Denis, Sanderson, Sangster, Scholfield, Shields, Simpson, Sinclair, Skinner, Smith (Essex), Smith (Toronto), Spence, Stedman, Taylor, Vaughan, Waters, Willson (Niagara Falls), Wilson (Lincoln), Wilson (London), Wright—66.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of nine Members.

COMMITTEE ON FISH AND GAME

Honourable Mr. Henry, Messrs. Acres, Aubin, Bell, Black, Blakelock, Bragg, Burt, Calder, Challies, Colliver, Cooke, Davis, Dunlop, Ecclestone, Elliott (Rainy River), Finlayson, Fraleigh, Graham, Graves, Hambly, Harcourt, Harrison, Henry (East Kent), Hill, Hipel, Hogarth, Hutchinson, Ireland, Jutten, Kennedy (Temiskaming), Kenning, Lancaster, Laughton, Lyons, Mahony, McCrea, Munro, McLean, McMillen, McNaughton, McQuibban, Monteith, Murphy (Beaches), Murray, Newman, Oakley, Oliver, Poisson, Raven, Reid, Robb, Robertson, Ross, Sanderson, Sangster, Seguin, Simpson, Sinclair, Skinner, Smith (Essex), Spence, Staples, Stedman, Strickland, Taylor, Vaughan, Willson (Niagara Falls), Wilson (Lincoln), Wilson (London)—70.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of seven Members.

COMMITTEE ON LABOUR

Honourable Mr. Henry, Messrs. Baird, Baxter, Blakelock, Elliott (Bruce), Harrison, Hutchinson, Jutten, Macaulay, Medd, McBrien, McCrea, McNaughton,

McQuibban, Morrison, Monteith, Murphy (Beaches), Murphy (St. Patrick), Murray, Oakley, Oliver, Robertson, Sinclair, Spence, Tweed, Vaughan—26.

The Quorum of said Committee to consist of seven Members.

Mr. McBrien, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented their First Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee has carefully examined the following Petitions and finds the notices as published in each case sufficient:—

Of the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Diocese of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass enlarging and defining the powers of the petitioners in respect to holding, mortgaging or otherwise dealing in lands.

Of the Western Savings and Loan Company of Winnipeg, praying that an Act may pass incorporating the company under The Ontario Companies Act.

Of the Townships of Drummond, North Elmsley, Beckwith, and Montague, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a diversion in the method of using a Government grant to the Black Creek Drainage Scheme.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Windsor, praying that an Act may pass validating and confirming By-law No. 3780 of the petitioning corporation and an agreement made with the Detroit and Windsor Subway Company under the terms thereof.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Whitby, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the annexation to the Town of Whitby of Lot No. 30 in the Broken Front of the Township of Whitby.

Of Les Révérends Pères Oblats de L'Immaculée Conception de Marie, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the name of the petitioning body and a definition of the rights of the petitioners to acquire and hold real estate.

Of the College of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the name of the petitioning body, to consolidate former Acts and to define the powers and duties of its governing bodies.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Port Arthur, praying that an Act may pass to alter the terms of certain by-laws, to authorize the issue of certain debentures and for other purposes.

Of Arthur Cyril Boyce, Harold MacKinlay Code, George B. Acheson, *et al*, praying that an Act may pass incorporating the petitioners as the Thousand Island Bridge Company with authority to construct a toll bridge connecting Hill Island with the mainland.

Of the Toronto General Trust Company and the Trusts and Guarantee Company, praying that an Act may pass to validate certain mortgages made by the Algoma Steel Corporation which are held by the petitioners.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 4), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur." *Mr. Hogarth.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 6), intituled "An Act respecting the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Diocese of Toronto." *Mr. Murphy* (St. Patrick).

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 10), intituled "An Act respecting the Township of Drummond, North Elmsley, Beckwith and Montague." *Mr. Stedman.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 12), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Windsor." *Mr. Wilson* (Windsor).

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 20), intituled "An Act respecting the Algoma Steel Corporation." *Mr. Lyons.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 27), intituled "An Act to incorporate Thousand Islands Bridge Company." *Mr. Skinner.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 28), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Whitby." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 33), intituled "An Act respecting Les Révérends Pères Oblats de L'Immaculée Conception de Marie." *Mr. Cote.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 34) intituled "An Act respecting the College of Ottawa." *Mr. Cote.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for consideration of the Speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session, having been read,

The Debate was resumed and, after some time, Mr. Sinclair moved, seconded by Mr. McQuibban,

That all the words of the Motion after the first word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

"This House deplores reductions in grants to Ontario schools without the repeal of regulations requiring expensive standards of equipment, so that the taxpayers might absorb such reductions through other economies in education."

And the Debate having been continued, after some time,

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Taylor,

That the Amendment to the Motion be amended by adding thereto the following words: "and this House begs to advise your Honour that the present Government does not enjoy the confidence of the majority of the people of Ontario and is maladministrating the public affairs under the mandate given Mr. Ferguson in 1929. We advise therefore that only routine business of the House be carried out with all possible dispatch and that the Legislature should then forthwith be dissolved."

And a Debate arising, after some time it was on the motion of Mr. Henry (York East),

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until Thursday next.

The House then adjourned at 9.15 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22nd

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Oakley, the Petition of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners.

By Mr. Vaughan, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of Crowland.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That the names of Mr. Hambly and Mr. Nixon be added to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization and the name of Mr. Strickland be added to the Committee on Legal Bills.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 62), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 63), intituled "An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 64), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 65), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 66), intituled "An Act to amend The Election Act." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 67), intituled "An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 68), intituled "An Act to amend The Jurors Act." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Ross asked the following Question (No. 8):—

1. Is there a special commission known as the Budget Committee at work in the service of the Province. 2. If so, who are they. How were they appointed and when. 3. What is the nature of their duties. 4. What remuneration does each receive.

The Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. The Prime Minister, the Attorney-General, the Provincial Treasurer, the Assistant Provincial Treasurer, the Controller of Revenue, the Civil Service Commissioner, the Provincial Auditor, and Colonel H. D. Lockhart-Gordon. Appointed by Order-in-Council dated the 29th day of December, 1932. 3. To compile the Annual and Supplementary Estimates accurately and complete in detail; to inquire into, examine and approve or disapprove of all Departmental expenditures; to study the existing organization,

activities and business methods of Departments and Branches with a view to the elimination of duplication and overlapping of work; the standardization of forms; the co-ordination in so far as possible of all services and purchasing; to advise upon the regrouping of services; to investigate all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement and payment of public funds; and to make suggestions generally looking toward efficiency and economy in Departmental expenditures.

4. No remuneration will be paid, except to Colonel Lockhart-Gordon, the remainder of the Committee being already in receipt of Government salaries.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 61), An Act to Conserve and Improve the Valley of the Don River.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 56), An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 57), An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 59), An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 60), An Act respecting Collection Agencies.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 4.10 p.m.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23RD, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Wilson (Windsor), the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Walkerville.

The following Petitions were read and received:—

Of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners, praying that an Act may pass confirming the title of the petitioners in certain lands of which they became owners under the Viaduct agreements of 1913 and 1924.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of Crowland, praying that an Act may pass validating and confirming By-law No. 214 of the petitioners providing for a fixed assessment on the property of the Page-Hersey Tubes, Limited.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Amendment to the Motion for the consideration of the Speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

And the Debate having been continued, after some time, it was on the motion of Mr. Strickland,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until Tuesday next.

The House then adjourned at 6.20 p.m.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was read and received:—

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Walkerville, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the method of dealing with lands in arrears for taxes, to alter the regulations governing the Walkerville Housing Commission, and for other purposes.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 69), intituled "An Act to amend The Northern Development Act." *Mr. Finlayson*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 70), intituled "An Act to amend the Long Point Park Act." *Mr. Finlayson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 71), intituled "An Act respecting the Publication and Distribution of Discriminating Matter." *Mr. Martin* (Hamilton West).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. Oliver asked the following Question (No. 1):—

1. Who are the members of the Agricultural Development Board. 2. What was the date of appointment and salary in each case. 3. Does each member come under the Public Service Superannuation scheme, if so, what was the age of each member when appointed. 4. What was the total number of (a) Permanent employees; (b) Temporary and occasional employees, under the Board during the last fiscal year. 5. What was the total wage bill of the Board during the last fiscal year.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

1. W. B. Roadhouse, Finlay G. MacDiarmid, John Elliott. 2. W. B. Roadhouse, May 1st, 1930, \$6,000.00 per annum; Finlay G. MacDiarmid, December 15th, 1932, \$3,000.00 per annum; John Elliott, December 15th, 1932, \$15.00 per day. (Less deductions in each case.) 3. Only the Chairman comes under the Superannuation scheme. 4. (a) 47; (b) 64. 5. \$132,214.63.

Mr. Nixon asked the following Question (No. 3):—

1. What has been the total cost of the Hydro Enquiry Commission. 2. How much has been paid to Counsel W. N. Tilley, K.C., in this connection. 3. Has anything been paid to any of the Commissioners. If so, to whom, and what amount in each case. 4. Has anything been paid to Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario in this connection or have they submitted any bill. 5. Have all obligations been discharged in connection with the Enquiry Commission. If not, how much remains unpaid.

The Honourable the Prime Minister for the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. \$15,102.37. 2. No account yet rendered. 3. Yes. Estate of the late Mr. Justice Orde, \$5,000.00; Honorarium to the Honourable Mr. Justice Riddell, \$1,500.00; Honorarium to the Honourable Mr. Justice Sedgewick, \$1,500.00. 4. No. 5. All accounts rendered have been paid. Cannot answer as to accounts not yet received.

Mr. Oliver asked the following Question (No. 4):—

1. Has the Barrie Packing Plant asked the Government for any financial assistance in the reorganization of their business. 2. Has the Government or the Minister of Agriculture promised any financial assistance. If so, on what terms. 3. Has the Government extended any financial assistance. If not, why not.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. No. 3. No. Matter is still under consideration.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 55), An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 58), An Act to amend The Execution Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

The House then adjourned at 3.20 p.m.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

On motion of Mr. Nesbitt, seconded by Mr. Heighington,

Ordered, That a Select Committee of this House be appointed to consider the best means of improving the method of preparing the Voters' List on which the Provincial Elections are held and to report back to this House during the present session, such Committee to be composed as follows:—

The Honourable Mr. Henry, Messrs. Price (Parkdale), Freele, Honeywell, Morrison, Nesbitt, Willson (Niagara Falls), Sinclair, Slack.

On motion of Mr. Price (Parkdale), seconded by Mr. Finlayson,

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Baird be added to the Select Committee appointed to act with Mr. Speaker in the control and management of the Library.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 72), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Health Act." *Mr. Tweed.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 73), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." *Mr. Tweed.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 62), An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 64), An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 65), An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 69), An Act to amend The Northern Development Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 70), An Act to amend The Long Point Park Act.

Referred to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 4.10 p.m.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. McNaughton, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Cornwall.

Mr. McBrien, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented their Second Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee has carefully examined the following Petitions and finds the Notices as published in each case sufficient:—

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Hamilton, praying that an Act may pass validating a debenture by-law of \$300,000.00 and authorizing the issue of debentures for \$652,000.00 for certain purposes.

Of the United Farmers' Co-operative Association, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the name of the Company, changes in the authorized capital stock of the Company and for other purposes.

Of the Trustees of the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust, praying that an Act may pass incorporating the Petitioners as a Hospital Trust according to law.

Of the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London, praying that an Act may pass to define and extend the powers of the Petitioners to hold, hypothecate, mortgage and otherwise deal in real estate and other securities.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Kenora, praying that an Act may pass to validate tax sales, to authorize debentures of the value of \$40,808.97 and for other purposes.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Peterborough, praying that an Act may pass altering the law regarding nomination for the position of Mayor in the said City so that a sitting Alderman must resign his seat in the Council at least five days before the date of the civic nominations if he desires to become a candidate for the office of Mayor.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Weston, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the date of holding municipal elections in the petitioning municipality, a change in the method of levying income tax, and for other purposes.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass to validate debentures and expenditures amounting to \$169,250.00 and for other purposes.

Of the Central Canada Exhibition Association, praying that an Act may pass to amend the Act of incorporation of the petitioners and to provide for certain changes in its membership.

Of the Mutual Relief Life Insurance Company, praying that an Act may pass to amend 19 Geo. V, c. 132, An Act respecting the Odd Fellows Relief Association of Canada for the purpose of altering the basis of valuation of contracts of the Mutual Relief Life Insurance Company issued prior to the 10th day of June, 1929.

Of St. Patrick's Asylum, Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass to change the official name of the petitioners to St. Patrick's Home.

Of the Windsor, Essex, and Lake Shore Electric Railway Association, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the petitioners to issue bonds for the purpose of replacing an existing bond issue.

Of the Essex Border Utilities Commission, praying that an Act may pass to provide that the Act governing the Commission shall not apply to the Township of Sandwich South, and to provide that Part VI of The Ontario Municipal Board Act shall apply to the Commission.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Sandwich, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a decrease in the size of the Town Council.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of East York, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the petitioners to enter into possession of lands in arrears of taxes without the formality of a tax sale, to authorize an annual salary for members of the Township Council and for other purposes.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Tillsonburg, praying that an Act may pass ratifying an agreement made by the petitioners to guarantee the bonds of the Tillsonburg Shoe Company to the amount of \$40,000.00.

Of the Township of Teck, praying that an Act may pass validating debenture by-laws to the value of \$64,600.00 and to validate tax sales.

Your Committee recommends that Rule No. 60 of Your Honourable House be suspended in this that the time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Tuesday, the 7th day of March next, and that the time for introducing Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Tuesday, the 14th day of March next.

Ordered, That the time for presenting Petitions for Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Tuesday, the 7th day of March next, and that the time for introducing Private Bills be extended until and inclusive of Tuesday, the 14th day of March next.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 2), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton." *Mr. Jutten*.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 37), intituled "An Act respecting the Township of Teck." *Mr. Kenning*.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 7), intituled "An Act respecting the United Farmers Co-operative Association." *Mr. Oliver.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 9), intituled "An Act to incorporate the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust." *Mr. Willson* (Niagara Falls).

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 19), intituled "An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London." *Mr. Moore.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 29), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Kenora." *Mr. Hutchinson.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 31), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Peterborough." *Mr. Strickland.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 21), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Weston." *Mr. Price* (West York).

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 16), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Toronto." *Mr. Oakley.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 5), intituled "An Act respecting the Central Canada Exhibition Association." *Mr. Ellis.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 1), intituled "An Act respecting the Mutual Relief Life Insurance Company." *Mr. Black.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 3), intituled "An Act respecting the St. Patricks Asylum, Ottawa." *Mr. Cote.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 14), intituled "An Act respecting the Essex Border Utilities Commission." *Mr. Wilson* (Windsor).

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 15), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Sandwich." *Mr. Reid*.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 13), intituled "An Act respecting the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Electric Railway Association." *Mr. Smith* (Essex South).

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 24), intituled "An Act respecting the Township of East York." *Mr. Case*.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 25), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg." *Mr. Baxter*.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 74), intituled "An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act." *Mr. McBrien*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 75), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." *Mr. Shields*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 76), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." *Mr. Nesbitt*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Amendment to the Motion for the consideration of the Speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

And the Debate having been continued, after some time, it was on the motion of Mr. Wilson (Windsor),

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until Thursday next.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of The Ontario Historical Society for the year 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 38.*)

Also, Annual Report of The Minimum Wage Board, Ontario, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 39.*)

Also, Orders-in-Council made under the authority of The Northern Development Act, 1929. (*Sessional Papers No. 36.*)

Also, Comparative Statement of Legislative Grants apportioned to Rural, Public and Separate Schools in the Counties and Districts for year 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 37.*)

The House then adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1st, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was read and received:—

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Cornwall, praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement under which the petitioners agree to convey a site for a factory to Powdrell and Alexander, Limited.

On motion of Mr. Kennedy, seconded by Mr. Macaulay,

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Medd be added to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

On motion of Mr. Price (Parkdale), seconded by Mr. Monteith,

Ordered, That Mr. Mahony be elected as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House for the present Session.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 77), intituled "An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act."
Mr. Macaulay.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Medd asked the following Question (No. 10):—

1. What did it cost the Province to have the portrait of Honourable G. H. Ferguson painted and hung.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

\$2,750.00. See Page C 6, Public Accounts, 1931.

Mr. Murray asked the following Question (No. 18):—

1. What was the amount of money spent for direct relief in the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, in each of the towns, Espanola, Blind River and Thessalon. 2. What portion of the same was paid by the Province.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. Espanola District (unincorporated), \$6,975.27; Blind River District, \$14,131.97; Thessalon, \$1,735.30. 2. Espanola District (unincorporated), \$3,487.62; Blind River District, \$6,933.47; Thessalon, \$616.66.

Mr. Tweed asked the following Question (No. 20):—

1. What amount of money has been set apart in each of the fiscal years in the Highway Improvement Fund since the creation of the said fund as provided in Section 7 of The Highway Improvement Act. 2. What portion of the said amount in each year was credited under the provisions of paragraphs A, B, C, and D of Subsection 1 of Section 8 of The Highway Improvement Act. 3. What part of said amount in each year was credited to the said fund by reason of an Order-in-Council under provisions of Subsection 3 of Section 8 of The Highway Improvement Act.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

1.—

November 1st, 1919	\$6,064,745 83	November 1st, 1926	\$15,219,211 76
" " 1920	12,075,658 91	" " 1927	14,886,999 50
" " 1921	18,311,236 70	" " 1928	16,335,889 34
" " 1922	24,377,410 12	" " 1929	21,916,457 31
" " 1923	9,178,456 22	" " 1930	23,012,713 43
" " 1924	12,155,146 46	" " 1931	22,984,719 27
" " 1925	17,240,178 15	" " 1932	26,266,305 14

2.—

		A	B	C	D
November 1st, 1919		\$1,580,000 00
"	" 1920	1,990,833 38	\$84,825 53
"	" 1921	2,954,360 36	1,050,242 67	\$1,315,663 87
"	" 1922	3,477,430 13	1,841,366 37	2,058,613 82
"	" 1923	4,296,009 32	1,177,398 66	705,048 24
"	" 1924	4,785,235 13	3,530,607 85	839,303 48
"	" 1925	5,638,993 38	5,771,344 05	855,406 62	\$1,974,434 10
"	" 1926	6,415,713 80	2,377,407 40	50,000 00	3,376,090 56
"	" 1927	5,964,863 63	1,835,924 78	53,269 37	4,032,941 72
"	" 1928	6,470,151 79	2,258,357 80	4,607,379 75
"	" 1929	7,848,448 58	2,570,414 79	8,497,593 94
"	" 1930	5,547,254 58	3,708,623 02	10,756,835 83
"	" 1931	5,610,442 80	3,423,631 08	10,950,645 39
"	" 1932	7,376,672 73	3,548,394 63	12,341,237 78

3.—November 1st, 1922, \$14,000,000.00.

Mr. Baxter asked the following Question (No. 21):—

1. What amounts have been collected by the Government from the estates of deceased persons, who in their lifetime were in receipt of Old Age Pensions.
2. What portion of such money so collected has been refunded or credited to the municipalities.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Welfare replied as follows:—

1. \$70,538.85.
 2. \$13,504.38, representing 20 per cent. of the total amount paid for pensions prior to November 1st, 1931, and 10 per cent. thereafter.
-

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 23):—

1. What amount of money was spent by the Government in conducting the census of traffic in each of the fiscal years ending on October 31st in the years 1931 and 1932.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

1. \$37,626.75 in 1931. \$23,427.26 in 1932.
-

Mr. Munro asked the following Question (No. 24):—

What is the total amount of money paid during the last fiscal year to Crown Counsel conducting criminal prosecutions at Assizes other than amounts paid to local Crown Attorneys.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

\$41,650.85.

Mr. Mackay asked the following Question (No. 25):—

1. What is the total amount now standing to the credit of the Public Service Superannuation Fund. 2. In what securities is this amount held and where are these securities deposited.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. Total amount of the credit of the Public Service Superannuation Fund as of October 31st, 1932, was \$4,345,659.00. 2. This amount remains in the custody of the Provincial Treasurer, as a portion of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Province, covered by Provincial debentures.

Mr. Mackay asked the following Question (No. 26):—

1. What is the total amount now standing to the credit of the Teachers' and Inspectors' Superannuation Fund. 2. In what securities is this amount held and where are these securities deposited.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. According to the books of the Teachers' and Inspectors' Superannuation Commission the amount now standing to the credit of the fund is \$17,684,830.57.

2. Securities held:

Province of Ontario bonds	\$17,400,000 00
Dominion of Canada bonds	15,000 00
City of St. Catharines bond	10,000 00
Balance in Bank	259,830 57
	<hr/>
	\$17,684,830 57

Securities deposited with the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 34):—

1. Who is the Clerk of the Surrogate Court for the County of Halton. 2. When was he appointed to the office. 3. What were his qualifications for the position. 4. Upon whose recommendation was he appointed.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. John MacDonald McKenzie. 2. December 16th, 1932. 3. A member of the Council of Milton for some years; also Mayor and Hydro Commissioner for

twelve years at Milton—and in the drug business in Milton for many years.

4. On the recommendation of the Attorney-General.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 36):—

1. What has been the total cost to date of the second section of the new East Wing of the Parliament Buildings. 2. Is the building now completed. 3. If the building is not completed, what is the estimated cost of completing the same.

The Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. \$1,512,959.83. 2. Yes. 3. Answered by No. 2.

Mr. Baxter asked the following Question (No. 37):—

What has been the total cost to date of surveying for the third or centre King's Highway through the Counties of Halton and Peel.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

\$8,809.14.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 67), An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 55), An Act to amend The Mining Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 56), An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario as at October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 20.*)

Also, Report of the Minister of Public Works and Labour, Ontario, for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 8.*)

The House then adjourned at 4.33 p.m.

THURSDAY, MARCH 2ND, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was brought up and laid upon the Table:—

By Mr. Hutchinson, the Petition of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Kenora.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 78), intituled "An Act to amend The Judicature Act." *Mr. Ellis.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Amendment to the Motion for the consideration of the Speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

And the Debate having been continued, after some time, it was on the motion of Mr. McArthur,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until Tuesday next.

The House then adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

FRIDAY, MARCH 3RD, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Petition was read and received:—

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Kenora, praying that an Act may pass validating a by-law authorizing the sale of the Kenora Hydro-Electric plant to the Keewatin Power Company, Limited, and granting a fixed assessment to the Company.

Mr. McNaughton, from the Standing Committee on Printing, presented their First Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee recommends that the \$25 supplies allowance per Member be continued.

It is recommended that Sessional Reports be printed in the following quantities:—

Public Accounts.....	2,800
Lands and Forests.....	1,600
Education.....	1,700
Hospital for Insane, Feeble-minded, Epileptics.....	900
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway.....	800
Elections.....	1,100
Hydro-Electric Power Commission.....	4,100
Public Records and Archives.....	3,100

The following report presented by the King's Printer showing the decrease in the amount of stock carried in the King's Printer's Office was approved and filed:—

October 31st, 1930:		
Stationery.....	\$34,273 20	
Contract paper.....	10,014 42	
		\$44,287 62
October 31st, 1931:		
Stationery.....	\$29,298 06	
Contract paper.....	6,863 07	
		36,161 13
October 31st, 1932:		
Stationery.....	\$24,820 43	
Contract paper.....	4,864 84	
		29,685 27

All of which is respectfully submitted.

D. A. McNAUGHTON,
Acting Chairman.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 79), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." *Mr. Singer.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 80), intituled "An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act." *Mr. McBrien.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. Bragg asked the following Question (No. 22):—

1. What is the total number of chattel mortgages taken by the Agricultural Development Board in the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932. 2. What is the total number of chattel mortgages now held by the Agricultural Development Board. 3. What is the total amount of money secured by such total number of chattel mortgages. 4. What is the total number of mortgages on land now held by the Agricultural Development Board. 5. What is the total amount of money secured by such mortgages.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

1. 975. 2. 2,044. 3. Chattel mortgages are taken as collateral security and not as a separate basis of money advances. 4. As of October 31st last, 13,854. 5. \$44,050,607.17.

Mr. Elliott (Bruce North) asked the following Question (No. 27):—

1. What is the total amount of reserves of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission for Ontario. 2. In what securities are these reserves held. 3. Where are these securities deposited.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. Reserves:

Sinking Fund.....	\$24,626,250	50
Renewals Reserve.....	22,565,643	63
Obsolescence and Contingencies.....	14,588,959	44
Staff Pension.....	2,906,584	52
Insurance.....	935,040	04
Guelph Radial Railway.....	109,240	31
		<hr/>
		\$65,731,718 44

2. Disposition of Reserve Funds:

Sinking Funds paid out:

Cash payments to Provincial Treasurer	\$14,853,440	35
Retirement of portion of Bonds of Commission, guaranteed by Province	7,220,574	95
	<hr/>	\$22,074,015 30

Sinking Fund Invested:

In Province of Ontario Bonds	2,086,904	77
--	-----------	----

Renewals, Obsolescence and Contingencies Funds

Invested:

In Province of Ontario Bonds	\$29,200,533	85
In T. & N.O. Railway Bonds, guaranteed by Province of Ontario	206,487	32
In Dominion of Canada Bonds	3,741,065	42
In C.N. Railway Bonds, guaranteed by Dominion of Canada	966,329	90
In Commission's Bonds, guaranteed by the Province of Ontario (temporary)	1,185,876	32
In Municipal Bonds received upon sale to municipalities of local distribution systems	1,379,810	32
	<hr/>	36,680,103 13

Expended (subject to reimbursement) on Radial

Railways	1,035,105	76
--------------------	-----------	----

Insurance Funds Invested:

In Province of Ontario Bonds	\$28,785	32
In Dominion of Canada Bonds	841,242	15
In C.N. Railway Bonds, guaranteed by Dominion of Canada	52,619	24
	<hr/>	922,646 71

Staff Pension Fund Invested:

In Province of Ontario Bonds	\$2,811,152	78
In Dominion of Canada Bonds	53,252	56
	<hr/>	2,864,405 34

Guelph Radial Railway Reserve Funds Invested:

In Province of Ontario Bonds	\$22,499	49
In Dominion of Canada Bonds	24,759	72
	<hr/>	47,259 21

Guelph Railway Reserve Funds paid out:

On account of purchase price of railway	73,505	41
---	--------	----

\$65,783,945 63

3. With the exception of the securities listed under "Sinking Funds invested" (Book value \$2,086,904.77) which are deposited with the Provincial Treasurer, Parliament Buildings, Toronto, all of the securities as listed in the attached statement stand deposited at this date in the Commission's vaults, located in the Toronto General Trust Company's building, Bay Street, Toronto.

Mr. Newman asked the following Question (No. 32):—

1. What is the amount of Gasoline Tax collected in each of the fiscal years 1931 and 1932. 2. What is the total number of (a) motor cars; (b) motor trucks registered in the fiscal years 1931 and 1932. 3. What has been the cost to the Government for collecting the Gasoline Tax in each of the years 1931 and 1932. 4. What is the total number of gallons of gasoline sold in the Province of Ontario in each of the years 1931 and 1932.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1.—1930-31	\$12,379,243 81
1931-32	13,510,754 65
2.—1930-31, cars.....	490,607
trucks.....	64,461
1931-32, cars.....	463,081
trucks.....	61,287
3.—1930-31	\$247,284 46
1931-32	247,932 17
4.—1930-31	gallons *248,054,717
1931-32	gallons *243,383,374

*Includes gasoline used in motor boats, farming, etc., on which tax is subsequently refunded.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 38):—

1. What was the total amount collected by the Government from race tracks during the fiscal year of 1932. 2. What was the amount collected from each of the race tracks.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1.—\$1,201,649.88.

2.— Track	Total
Devonshire.....	\$115,547 62
Dufferin.....	204,659 76
Fort Erie.....	101,444 99
Hamilton.....	113,946 27
Kenilworth.....	78,375 93
Long Branch.....	161,506 29
Niagara Falls.....	77,727 92
Thorncliffe.....	188,983 59
Woodbine.....	159,457 51
	<hr/>
	\$1,201,649 88

Mr. Tweed asked the following Question (No. 40):—

1. How many farm mortgage loans were made in 1932 by the Agricultural Development Board. 2. What was the total amount of the new loans made by the Board in 1932. 3. What was the total amount, of the proceeds of loans made in 1932, paid direct to Banks upon order of the borrower.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:

1. 2,647. 2. \$8,500,000. 3. No figures are available.

Mr. Taylor asked the following Question (No. 41):—

1. What has been the total cost of erecting and furnishing the Ontario Government Building in London, England.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. \$123,724.30.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 59), An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 58), An Act to amend The Execution Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 70), An Act to amend The Long Point Park Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 69), An Act to amend The Northern Development Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 74), An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

The House then adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

TORONTO, MONDAY, MARCH 6TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 81), intituled "An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 82), intituled "An Act to repeal The Optometry Act, 1931." *Mr. Murphy* (St. Patricks).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 83), intituled "An Act to amend The Medical Act." *Mr. Robb*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 84), intituled "An Act to amend The Registration of Nurses Act." *Mr. Robb*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 85), intituled "An Act for The Preservation of War Memorials." *Mr. Smith* (Essex).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 86), intituled "An Act to amend The Theatres and Cinematographs Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 87), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." *Mr. Oakley*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 88), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." *Mr. Oakley*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 89), intituled "An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Nixon asked the following Question (No. 6):—

1. Has Mr. W. N. Tilley, K.C., or any member of the firm of Tilley, Johnson, Thomson and Parmenter, Barristers, or the firm itself been retained by the Government or the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in connection with the acquiring of the Abitibi Power Development. 2. If so, what has been the total amount paid in this connection. Is the account closed or not.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. \$10,000.00. No.

Mr. Hipel asked the following Question (No. 30):—

1. How many retail gasoline vendors are at present in arrears in paying the Gasoline Tax to the Government. 2. What is the total of these arrears. 3. How long have these arrears been standing. 4. What steps have been taken to collect these arrears.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. Vendors, 16. 2. Total, \$41,487.90. 3. From two months to one year.

4. Four covered by bond	\$12,632 92
Two in bankruptcy, estates not settled. Bonding Company will pay balance owing.	
Seven satisfactory arrangements have been made to pay this amount off.	26,707 04
The agreements of these dealers have been cancelled and they are now buying gasoline "tax paid." This amount being reduced monthly.	
Four in dispute.....	1,219 11
One—Controller of Revenue.....	928 83

Mr. Elliott (Bruce North) asked the following Question (No. 31):—

1. What has been the total capital expenditure of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in each of the fiscal years 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932.
2. What has been the capital expenditure in each of the different systems during the fiscal years, 1930, 1931 and 1932.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1.— Fiscal Year	Capital Expenditures
1928	\$7,355,116 54
1929	13,336,294 35
1930 Including Dominion Power & Transmission Company	37,709,258 62
1931	12,860,830 89
1932	4,572,548 65
2.—	
Niagara System:	
1930.....	31,520,093 64
1931.....	8,702,646 51
1932.....	3,912,969 70
Georgian Bay System:	
1930.....	1,630,632 01
1931.....	262,778 50
1932.....	125,580 32
Eastern Ontario System:	
1930.....	959,847 14
1931.....	702,374 33
1932.....	238,692 64
Thunder Bay System:	
1930.....	2,320,385 31
1931.....	760,567 08
1932.....	74,375 12

Northern Districts—Sudbury, Abitibi and Patricia:

1930.....	\$1,267,457 19
1931.....	2,427,957 05
1932.....	112,310 78

Miscellaneous:

1930.....	10,843 33
1931.....	4,507 42
1932.....	93,500 48

Mr. Robertson asked the following Question (No. 51):—

1. What method has been in use in dispensing relief in the unorganized territory in northern Ontario. 2. What method has been in use in dispensing relief in the organized districts. 3. Through what agency was it handled by the Province.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Welfare replied as follows:—

1. Through Relief Officers appointed by the Province. 2. Through the municipalities. 3. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. Newman asked the following Question (No. 57):—

What was the cost of furnishing the new wing in the East Block.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

No expenditure made. Departments moving into the new wing of the East Block furnished the rooms with furniture that was on hand.

Mr. Mackay asked the following Question (No. 67):—

1. Have the salaries of the Normal School teachers been reduced during the years 1930, 1931 and 1932. 2. If so, what percentage.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. No reductions, but Normal School teachers were subject to the same assessment as were all members of the Civil Service from January 1st, 1932. 2. A graded assessment from 2 per cent. to 25 per cent.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 75), An Act to amend The Assessment Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 76), An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 60), An Act respecting Collection Agencies, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report progress, and to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 57), An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report progress, and to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 4.37 p.m.

TUESDAY, MARCH 7TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. McBrien, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented their Third Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee has carefully examined the following Petitions and finds the Notices as published in each case sufficient:—

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Village of Forest Hill, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the method of making assessments for income taxation and for other purposes.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Niagara, praying that an Act may pass to authorize and confirm a certain local improvement by-law and to authorize the issue of debentures to the amount of \$4,500.00.

Of James Grant, William A. Patterson, *et al*, praying that an Act may pass separating a portion of the Township of Scarborough, and constituting it a new Township to be known as North Scarborough.

Of the Canadian Transit Company and the Detroit International Bridge Company, praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement made between the Petitioners and the Town of Sandwich respecting a fixed assessment on the assets of the Petitioners.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Cornwall, praying that an Act may pass to validate By-law No. 26 of the said Town and the issue of debentures to the amount of \$49,337.15 thereunder.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of London, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the rental by the Petitioners of spaces on the boulevards in London for commercial purposes, to validate tax sales and for other purposes.

Of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners, praying that an Act may pass confirming the title of the Petitioners in certain lands of which they became owners under the Viaduct agreements of 1913 and 1924.

Of Havergal College, praying that an Act may pass amending the Act of Incorporation of the Petitioners so as to alter the terms of appointment and service of the directors.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of St. Catharines, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Petitioners to establish a fund to be known as the Workmen's Compensation Fund, to increase the membership of the Public Utilities Commission of St. Catharines from three to five and for other purposes.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass to authorize debenture by-laws totalling \$240,000.00 and for other purposes.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of York, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the formation of a Board of Education for the Township, to validate a debenture by-law for \$10,000.00 and for other purposes.

Of the Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass declaring that the Petitioners are entitled to any charitable bequests and devises heretofore or hereafter made in favour of the Ottawa Protestant Infants' Home.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Cornwall, praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement under which the Petitioners agree to convey a site for a factory to Powdrell and Alexander, Limited.

Of the Ferranti Electric, Limited, praying that an Act may pass validating a by-law of the Township of York for the purpose of fixing for a period of ten years the Township assessment on the property of the Petitioners.

Of the City of Welland, praying that an Act may pass validating By-law No. 827 of the Petitioners and ratifying an agreement with the Empire Cotton Mills Company, Limited, providing for a fixed assessment of the Company's assets.

Mr. Price, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their First Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills without amendment:—

Bill (No. 3), An Act respecting St. Patrick's Asylum of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 20), An Act respecting Algoma Steel Corporation, Limited.

Bill (No. 28), An Act respecting the Town of Whitby.

Bill (No. 33), An Act to amend the Act incorporating Les Révérends Pères Oblats de l'Immaculée Conception de Marie.

Bill (No. 37), An Act respecting the Township of Teck.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill (No. 3), "An Act respecting St. Patrick's Asylum of Ottawa," on the ground that it relates to a charitable institution, and on Bill (No. 33), "An Act to amend the Act incorporating Les Révérends Pères Oblats de l'Immaculée Conception de Marie," on the ground that it relates to a religious institution.

Ordered, That the fees, less the penalties and the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 3), "An Act respecting St. Patrick's Asylum of Ottawa," on the ground that it relates to a charitable institution, and on Bill (No. 33), "An Act to amend the Act incorporating Les Révérends Pères Oblats de l'Immaculée Conception de Marie," on the ground that it relates to a religious institution.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 11), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Niagara." *Mr. Graves*.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 17), intituled "An Act respecting The Canadian Transit Company." *Mr. Reid.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 18), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall." *Mr. McNaughton.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 26), intituled "An Act respecting the City of London." *Mr. Moore.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 30), intituled "An Act respecting Havergal College." *Mr. Baird.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 32), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa." *Mr. Ellis.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 35), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Welland." *Mr. Vaughan.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 38), intituled "An Act respecting certain lands of The Toronto Harbour Commissioners." *Mr. Oakley.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 39), intituled "An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines." *Mr. Graves.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 43), intituled "An Act respecting Ferranti Electric, Limited." *Mr. Price (West York).*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 36), intituled "An Act respecting Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa." *Mr. Ellis.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 22), intituled "An Act respecting the Village of Forest Hill." *Mr. Oakley.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 23), intituled "An Act to Incorporate the Township of North Scarborough." *Mr. Oakley.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 42), intituled "An Act respecting the Township of York." *Mr. Price* (West York).

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 44), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall and the Powdrell and Alexander Company of Canada, Limited." *Mr. McNaughton.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 50), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." *Mr. Lancaster.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Amendment to the Motion for the consideration of the Speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

And the Debate having been continued, after some time, it was on the motion of Mr. Ross,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until Thursday next.

The House then adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 51), intituled "An Act to Provide for Giving Threshers a Lien in Certain Cases." *Mr. Newman.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 52), intituled "An Act respecting The Ontario Institute of Radio Therapy." *Mr. Robb.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 49), intituled "The Mortgages and Purchasers Relief Act, 1933." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 53), intituled "An Act to amend The Marriage Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Hipel asked the following Question (No. 29):—

1. What was the total cost of constructing the bridge on No. 7 Highway at Breslau, including costs of C.N.R. subway, grading and paving approaches, etc. 2. What was the cost of constructing the bridge proper. 3. What was the cost of grading the approaches and roadways leading to the paved portions. 4. What was the cost of paving the approaches and roadways leading to the paved portions. 5. What was the Province's share of building the C.N.R. subway. 6. Were competitive tenders asked for the grading of approaches, etc. 7. Were competitive tenders asked for the paving of approaches.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

1. \$270,963.01. 2. \$129,760.29. 3. \$27,796.40. 4. \$36,480.78. 5. Province 60 per cent. of cost, less \$10,000 paid by C.N.R. Grade Crossing Fund 40 per cent. 6. Yes. 7. No. (Paving was awarded to the grading contractor owing to urgent traffic conditions.)

Mr. Oliver asked the following Question (No. 45):—

1. What was the total cost of building the bridge over Pere Marquette Railway in the Corporation of Blenheim on No. 3 Highway.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. \$15,368.04.

Mr. Newman asked the following Question (No. 58):—

1. What was the cost to the University of Toronto of the Botanical Buildings. 2. What was the cost of the Conservatory in connection with the Botanical Building.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

The Botany Building is not yet completed. The estimated total cost including building, furnishings and equipment is \$517,000.00 of which the sum of \$39,307.28 is for greenhouses.

Mr. Robertson asked the following Question (No. 59):—

What was the capital construction cost of University of Toronto buildings in each of the last five years.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

Expenditures by the University:

1929.....	\$362,017 71
1930.....	452,427 77
1931.....	471,097 74
1932.....	518,119 28

Expenditures paid out of bequest of the late E. C. Whitney:

1931.....	\$330,887 00
1932.....	159,251 37

Expenditures paid out of the Rockefeller Foundation Grant and Connaught Laboratories Funds:

1928.....	\$11,273 00
1931.....	9,141 52
1932.....	179,591 60

Expenditures paid by Massey Foundation and from Hart House Funds:

1931.....	\$112,484 02
1932.....	4,586 51

Expenditure paid by the University Athletic Association:

1928.....	\$22,016 58
-----------	-------------

Mr. Sangster asked the following Question (No. 60):—

1. What was the cost during the last fiscal year of snow removal from King's Highway No. 2. 2. Is snow removal on said Highway during the present winter being taken care of by contract or by pay for actual work done.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

1. \$15,484.91. 2. By contract and day labour.

On motion of Mr. Blakelock, seconded by Mr. Tweed,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing: 1. What is the total cost to date of the new wing of the Royal Ontario Museum. 2. Who was the contractor. 3. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tender. 4. What other companies tendered. 5. What was the amount in each case. 6. What amount was allowed for extras above the contract price.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 63), An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 72), An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

Bill (No. 80), An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 79), An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 73), An Act to amend The Municipal Act, having been read,

Mr. Tweed moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on a Division.

And so it was declared in the Negative.

The House then adjourned at 4.47 p.m.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Price, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Second Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee begs to report the following Bill without amendment:—

Bill (No. 9), An Act to incorporate the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust.

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 1), An Act respecting the Mutual Relief Life Insurance Company.

Bill (No. 16), An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees, less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill (No. 9), "An Act to incorporate the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust," on the ground that it relates to a charitable institution.

Ordered, That the fees, less the penalties and the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 9), "An Act to incorporate the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust," on the ground that it relates to a charitable institution.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 54), intituled "An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act." *Mr. Laughton*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Amendment to the Motion for the consideration of the Speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

And the Debate having been continued, after some time, it was on the motion of Mr. Oliver,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until Tuesday next.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Return to an Order of the House, dated March 8th, 1933, That there be laid before the House a Return showing: 1. What is the total cost to date of the new wing of the Royal Ontario Museum. 2. Who was the contractor. 3. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tender. 4. What other companies tendered. 5. What was the amount in each case. 6. What amount was allowed for extras above the contract price. (*Sessional Paper No. 40.*)

The House then adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

FRIDAY, MARCH 10TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 90), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Schools Act." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 91), intituled "An Act to amend The Adolescent School Attendance Act." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 92), intituled "An Act to amend The High Schools Act." *Mr. Sinclair.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. Baxter asked the following Question (No. 13):—

1. What amount was expended on the road from Espanola to McKerrow during each of the years 1931 and 1932. 2. What is the total length of this road.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. 1931, \$200.00; 1932, \$300.00. 2. Approximately three miles.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 14):—

1. How many yards of gravel were purchased for the Espanola-Little Current Highway in each of the years 1931 and 1932. 2. What amounts were paid for the gravel, and to whom were the payments made.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. 1931, 3,970 cubic yards; 1932, 335 cubic yards. 2. Ten cents per cubic yard; payments were made to R. L. Graham, Little Current; D. St. Denis, Espanola; J. Dever, West River.

Mr. Murray asked the following Question (No. 15):—

What amounts were paid for the right-of-way for highway purposes across LaCloche Island, and to whom were these payments made.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

No payments were made for right-of-way.

Mr. Newman asked the following Question (No. 16):—

What amount was expended on the roads of the constituency of Algoma by the Government during each of the years 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1929, \$296,376.65; 1930, \$472,502.84; 1931, \$368,182.31; 1932, \$246,932.12.

Mr. Sangster asked the following Question (No. 17):—

What amount was expended on the roads of Manitoulin Island by the Government during each of the years 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1929, \$80,992.46; 1930, \$138,878.85; 1931, \$170,284.05; 1932, \$130,758.81. Over and above these amounts, the following money was spent by municipalities, of which half was paid each year by the Department: 1929, \$19,164.92; 1930, \$18,825.29; 1931, \$18,291.13; 1932, \$12,059.81.

Mr. Bragg asked the following Question (No. 62):—

1. What is the total cost to date of the Ontario-Manitoba road between Keewatin and the Manitoba boundary. 2. What is the cost per mile of the completed highway. 3. How many miles of this road are completed. 4. How many miles of this road are under construction.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. \$689,146.98. 2. \$25,052.70. 3. 16.2 miles. 4. None at the present time.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 3), An Act respecting St. Patrick's Asylum of Ottawa.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 20), An Act respecting The Algoma Steel Corporation.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 28), An Act respecting the Town of Whitby.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 33), An Act to amend the Act incorporating Les Révérends Pères Oblats de l'Immaculée Conception de Marie.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 37), An Act respecting the Township of Teck.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 9), An Act to incorporate the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 1), An Act respecting the Mutual Relief Life Insurance Company.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 16), An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 87), An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 88), An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 81), An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 84), An Act to amend The Registration of Nurses Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 86), An Act to amend The Theatres and Cinematographs Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Special Committee on the Game Situation, 1931-1933.
(*Sessional Papers No. 32.*)

The House then adjourned at 3.40 p.m.

TORONTO, MONDAY, MARCH 13TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 93), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." *Mr. Jutten.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 94), intituled "An Act to amend The Old Age Pensions Act." *Mr. Martin (Brantford).*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 95), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." *Mr. Jutten.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 96), intituled "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act." *Mr. Robertson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 35):—

1. Has the Government had efficiency experts working during the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, in any of the Government Departments to ascertain whether improved methods in operating can be secured. 2. If so, in what Departments have they been operating. 3. What is the total cost to date of the work which has been done by them. 4. What suggestions for greater efficiency, if any, have been made.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. Treasury Department, Bond Branch, Agricultural Department, and Agricultural Development Board. 3. \$4,000.00. 4. Various suggestions have been offered in confidential reports, some of which are being acted upon while others are receiving consideration. It is not considered advisable at the present time to give publicity to the contents of these reports.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 39):—

1. How many allowances of refunds of Gasoline Tax have been made by the Government to individuals or companies after the six-months' limit for application for refund has expired. 2. What is the total amount of the refunds which have been so made after the expiry of the six-months' limit.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:

1. From July 1st, 1930, to October 31st, 1932, 92,682 applications for refund have been received. It is impossible to answer this question without examining each of the files. 2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. Slack asked the following Question (No. 44):—

1. What has been the total excess cost of that portion of power from the Gatineau for which we pay in United States funds, because of the adverse exchange rates. 2. (a) Is the Hydro-Electric Power Commission accepting and distributing in Ontario all the power for which they pay the Gatineau and

Beauharnois Companies. (b) If not, how much is not distributed in Ontario and how much per horsepower does the Hydro-Electric Power Commission receive for it.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1.—From September, 1931, to January, 1933, inclusive:

Total amount paid for exchange on Gatineau contract... \$739,676 04

Total amount received from exchange on power sales.... 140,365 21

Total cost of exchange *re* power..... \$599,310 83

2. (a). Yes. (b) Answered by No. 2 (a).

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 56):—

1. What is the total cost of the Ontario Research Foundation to date.
2. How much of this is capital expenditure.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. The total cost to the Province of the Ontario Research Foundation to the end of the fiscal year 1932 was \$1,867,209.00. 2. This was all capital expenditure.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 63):—

1. How much money has been expended on the Trans-Canada Highway by the Ontario Government.
2. How many miles of Highway have been completed and are now being used for traffic.
3. What is the cost per mile for that portion of the Highway built and in use.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. \$6,926,110.75. This work has been carried on as a relief measure and of the said amount approximately 50 per cent. is being repaid by the Dominion Government.
2. 142.3 miles completed and being used for traffic, but large additional mileage partially completed and being used for traffic in various ways.
3. Cost not obtainable until work of each camp is completed.

Mr. Slack asked the following Question (No. 72):—

1. Is the Provincial Government buying or handling clothing, boots and shoes, etc., for relief purposes. If not, to whom has the Government delegated this activity.
2. Where is the buying office and warehouse located.
3. Who is in charge of the buying office and warehouse.
4. What are the salaries paid to each individual employee.
5. What companies or individuals produce these

goods and where are the factories located. 6. What is the amount of purchases to date from each of the above individuals or factories. 7. Is the Sales Tax included in the prices quoted to the Government. If not included, how is it taken care of. 8. What assurance has the Government that the minimum wage is recognized and such scale paid in the factories where this relief merchandise is made. 9. Are there accounts being guaranteed by the Government.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. No. The Government has not delegated this activity to anyone. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 answered by No. 1.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 3), An Act respecting St. Patrick's Asylum of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 20), An Act respecting The Algoma Steel Corporation.

Bill (No. 28), An Act respecting the Town of Whitby.

Bill (No. 33), An Act to amend the Act incorporating Les Révérends Pères Oblats de l'Immaculée Conception de Marie.

Bill (No. 37), An Act respecting the Township of Teck.

Bill (No. 9), An Act to incorporate the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust.

Bill (No. 1), An Act respecting the Mutual Relief Life Insurance Company.

Bill (No. 16), An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without Amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 57), An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 60), An Act respecting Collection Agencies, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 81), An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 84), An Act to amend The Registration of Nurses Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 86), An Act to amend The Theatres and Cinematographs Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 68), An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

Bill (No. 71), An Act respecting the Publication and Distribution of Discriminating Matter.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

Bill (No. 54), An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 83), An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 4.48 p.m.

TUESDAY, MARCH 14TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. McBrien, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented their Fourth Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee has carefully examined the following Petitions and finds the Notices as published in each case sufficient:—

Of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Windsor, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Petitioners without taking a vote of the people to establish a Public Utilities Commission to administer the various public utilities.

Of the Toronto East General Hospital praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm an agreement under which the Toronto Orthopedic Hospital became amalgamated with the Petitioners.

Of the Ontario Master Barbers and Hairdressers Association, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the establishment of a Board of Governors to control and regulate the practice of hairdressing in the Province of Ontario.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Township of Crowland, praying that an Act may pass validating and confirming By-law No. 214 of the Petitioners providing for a fixed assessment on the property of the Page-Hersey Tubes, Limited.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Walkerville, praying that an Act may pass authorizing a change in the method of dealing with lands in arrears for taxes, to alter the regulations governing the Walkerville Housing Commission and for other purposes.

Of the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Kenora, praying that an Act may pass validating a by-law authorizing the sale of the Kenora Hydro-Electric plant to the Keewatin Power Company, Limited, and granting a fixed assessment to the Company.

Mr. Price, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Third Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:—

Bill (No. 5), An Act respecting The Central Canada Exhibition Association.

Bill (No. 18), An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall.

Bill (No. 35), An Act respecting the City of Welland.

Bill (No. 36), An Act respecting Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa.

Bill (No. 38), An Act respecting The Toronto Harbour Commissioners.

Your Committee begs to report the following Bill with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 32), An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill (No. 36), "An Act respecting Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa," on the ground that it relates to a charitable institution.

Ordered, That the fees, less the penalties and the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 36), "An Act respecting Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa," on the ground that it relates to a charitable institution.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 40), intituled "An Act respecting the City of Windsor." *Mr. Reid*.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 41), intituled "An Act respecting the amalgamation of Toronto East General Hospital and Toronto Orthopedic Hospital." *Mr. Oakley*.

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 45), intituled "An Act respecting Hairdressers and Barbers." *Mr. Nesbitt.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 46), intituled "An Act respecting the Township of Crowland." *Mr. Vaughan.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 47), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Walkerville." *Mr. Wilson (Windsor).*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 48), intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Kenora and the Keewatin Power Company, Limited." *Mr. Hutchinson.*

Referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill (No. 97), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." *Mr. McLean.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 98), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." *Mr. Bell.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 99), intituled "An Act to amend The Innkeepers Act." *Mr. Murphy (St. Patricks).*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Amendment to the Motion for the consideration of the Speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

And the Debate having been continued, after some time, it was on the motion of Mr. Price,

Ordered, That the Debate be further adjourned until Thursday next.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Elliott (Bruce North) be added to the Select Committee considering the preparation of the Voters' List for Provincial Elections.

The House then adjourned at 6.08 p.m.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That the Standing Committee on Fish and Game be given permission to hold sittings concurrently with the sittings of this House.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 100), intituled "The Nursery Stock Act." *Mr. Finlayson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 101), intituled "An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act."
Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 102), intituled "The Northern Ontario Appropriation Act, 1933."
Mr. Finlayson.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Taylor asked the following Question (No. 5):—

1. On what date did the Government offer to take over the Abitibi Power Development from the Ontario Power Service Corporation. 2. What were the terms of the offer. 3. Has the offer been definitely accepted and the deal completed. 4. What is the total obligation incurred by the Province in this matter. 5. What were the names and addresses of the bondholders and the amounts each held of the bonds of Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited involved in this deal.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. The Government has never offered to take over the Abitibi Power Development but on or about 5th August, 1932, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario at the request of the Government made a public offer to the holders of the bonds of Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited to acquire such bonds in exchange for debentures of the Commission guaranteed by the Province of Ontario. 2. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario by public advertisement offered to acquire the bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited by exchanging for the same 20-year debentures of the Commission guaranteed by the Province of Ontario on the basis of

\$90 of such debentures for each \$100 of bonds of Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited, such debentures to be dated October 1st, 1932, and to bear interest at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. up to 1st October, 1937; at 4 per cent. up to 1st October, 1942, and thereafter until maturity at 5 per cent. and payable both as to principal and interest in lawful money of Canada and redeemable at the option of the Commission at par. 3. Over 97 per cent. of the bondholders of Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited have accepted the offer. 4. The Government has agreed to indemnify the Commission in connection with the transaction. The development has not been completed and the extent of the liability of the Government under its indemnity has not yet been ascertained. 5. The Government is not aware of the names and addresses of the bondholders and the amounts held by them respectively.

Mr. Slack asked the following Question (No. 12):—

1. Is the position of chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board a full-time or a part-time job. 2. If full-time, does the chairman still carry on his profession of law. 3. If so, what were his receipts during each of the last three fiscal years from fraternal organizations, corporations or private individuals.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. Full-time. 2. No, except as Advisor for the Canadian Order of Foresters, which he has held for many years. 3. Nothing from any corporation or individuals. A retaining fee as Advisor to the C.O.F. \$1,600.00.

Mr. Sangster asked the following Question (No. 33):—

What is the total number of employees in the Civil Service (a) inside; (b) outside, in each of the fiscal years 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

Inside and outside Service as of October 31st, in each year named:

1929	Inside.....	2,117	1931	Inside.....	2,271
	Outside.....	4,811		Outside.....	5,464
	Total.....	6,928		Total.....	7,735
1930	Inside.....	2,194	1932	Inside.....	2,312
	Outside.....	5,233		Outside.....	5,448
	Total.....	7,427		Total.....	7,760

Mr. Baxter asked the following Question (No. 48):—

1. What is the total amount of money that has been advanced to the T. & N.O. Railway. 2. What has been the total amounts in interest charges to date. 3. What amount has been paid to the Government on these charges by the T. & N.O. to date.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. \$30,207,934.92. 2. None. 3. \$15,088,245.16.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 49):—

1. What has been the total profit of the Liquor Control Board for each of the fiscal years ending October 31st, 1931, and 1932. 2. What were the total sales of the Liquor Control Board in each of the fiscal years ending October 31st, 1931, and 1932. 3. What has been the total amount of money turned over by the Liquor Control Board to the Provincial Treasurer in each of the fiscal years ending October 31st, 1931, and 1932. 4. What was the total number of employees of the Liquor Control Board in each of the fiscal years ending October 31st, 1931, and 1932. 5. How many of these employees were ex-service men.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. The total profit of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario for the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1931, was \$8,491,653.43, and for 1932 was \$6,632,420.48.

2. During the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1931, the Liquor Control Board of Ontario sold:

Spirituous liquors.....	\$24,272,171 09
Wines.....	3,530,743 30
Beer.....	1,737,793 98
And sales of beer direct to permit holders from breweries and brewery warehouses totalled.....	16,294,999 40
	<hr/> \$45,835,707 77

And during the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, the Liquor Control Board of Ontario sold:

Spirituous liquors.....	\$18,303,988 39
Wines.....	2,927,973 20
Beer.....	1,557,772 86
And sales of beer direct to permit holders from breweries and brewery warehouses totalled.....	13,309,827 40
	<hr/> \$36,099,561 85

3. In the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1931..... 10,875,000 00
In the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932..... 9,905,000 00

4. On October 31st, 1931, the employment of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario numbered 1,158, of which forty-five were either part-time or seasonally employed, and on October 31st, 1932, the employment of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario numbered 1,115, of which forty were either part-time or seasonally employed. 5. On October 31st, 1931, of the 1,011 male employees of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario, 344 were ex-service men. On October 31st, 1932, of the 977 male employees of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario, 333 were ex-service men.

Note: The Liquor Control Board took over 150 of staff from the O.T.A. Board. In addition to the 333 who served Overseas there are 355 employees who had members of the family serve Overseas.

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 50):—

1. What were the outstanding liabilities, if any, of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, when the Government entered into negotiations with the Company for the purchase of its assets. 2. To whom were the liabilities due. 3. Have these liabilities been paid by the Government. 4. What amount of money has been or is required to complete the project and for which the Government is responsible.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. The Government has never entered into negotiations with the Ontario Power Service Corporation for the purchase of its assets, but on or about 5th August, 1932, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, at the request of the Government, made a public offer to the holders of the bonds of Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited to acquire such bonds in exchange for debentures of the Commission guaranteed by the Province of Ontario. At this time the outstanding liabilities of the Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited, as far as known, were: (a) On bonds, \$20,000,000 and interest at $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. from 1st January, 1932; (b) Estimated claims of contractors and creditors to a maximum of \$5,000,000. 2. To bondholders and to various contractors and persons having contracts with the Company. 3. No. 4. It is estimated that \$5,000,000 will be sufficient to complete the project and to pay liabilities and of this amount it is expected that approximately \$2,600,000 is available in the hands of the Montreal Trust Company, trustee under the bond mortgage securing the bonds of the Company.

Mr. Elliott (Bruce North) asked the following Question (No. 61):—

Does the Sinking Fund Reserves of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, as shown in the Annual Report, include the \$20,000,000 equity of the municipalities.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

The Municipal Sinking Fund equity shown in the Commission's 1931 Annual Report, page 270 (Consolidated Balance Sheet) and page 319, Statement "A" (Summary of All Systems), amounting to \$20,103,275.76, represents the accumulation of the Sinking Fund collections by the Commission from the municipalities operating under cost contracts—collected as part of the cost of power, which with improvement at 4 per cent. per annum amounts to the above-mentioned figure. This sum represents *part* of the Commission's total reserves for Sinking Fund. Each municipality's share thereof is shown in the municipal books, placed therein by the following entry: Debit—Account called "Equity in H.E.P.C. System," Credit—Account called "For Equity in H.E.P.C. System." The difference between the Commission's Balance Sheet figure of \$21,394,972.88 and the sum above mentioned, \$20,103,275.76, represents the Sinking Fund collections in respect of power supplied to the Commission's Rural Power Districts and Service Buildings, and also the Sinking Fund collected in the cost of power from London Railway Commission, Toronto Transportation Commission, Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Radial Railway Company, and the Windsor, Essex Radial Association.

Mr. Ross asked the following Question (No. 66):—

1. What arrangements have been made with Colonel H. D. Lockhart-Gordon for remuneration for services on the Budget Committee. 2. If on a per diem basis, what is the amount.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. No arrangements made as the amount of work involved not known.
2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 79):—

1. With whom did the Hydro-Electric Power Commission have contracts for the delivery of power to be developed by the Ontario Power Service Corporation, prior to the acquisition by the Province of the Abitibi Power site.
2. What amounts of power were so contracted for delivery and at what price.
3. What contracts have been made for the delivery of power since such acquisition and what amounts of power are involved and what are the prices to be received for such power.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. The Province has not yet acquired the Abitibi Power Development. At the time when the Hydro-Electric Power Commission offered to acquire the bonds of Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited the Commission had contracts for delivery of power to International Nickel Company of Canada Limited, Abitibi Power & Paper Company Limited and Abitibi Electric Development Company Limited. 2. (a) International Nickel Company of Canada

Limited, 16,000 h.p. at 4.25 mills per kilowatt hour, with a minimum of \$18.00 per h.p. per year deliverable at Sudbury. (b) Abitibi Power & Paper Company Limited, 10,000 h.p. at \$22.00 per h.p., deliverable at Sudbury. (c) Abitibi Electric Development Company Limited, 35,000 h.p. at \$13.00 per h.p. deliverable at Abitibi Canyon. 3. None.

Mr. Hipel asked the following Question (No. 81):—

1. On what page of the Public Accounts does the statement "Comparison of Current Expenditure on Highways to Current Revenue for Highway Purposes" appear as shown on page 52 of the Budget Address delivered March 12th, 1931.
2. On what page of the Public Accounts for 1930-31 does the Highway Debt Retirement appear.
3. On what page of the Public Accounts for 1930-31 does the Highway Improvement Fund appear.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Highways replied as follows:—

1. This statement is a compilation of various figures contained in the Public Accounts, and calculations based thereon. (See Public Accounts, pages 21, H 2-3, L 2-3, 11; P 4.)
 2. Highway debt not shown separately, but included in Gross Debt. Debt Retirement, except for the portion of the Provincial Debt incurred for the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, not provided for in 1931, due to economic conditions.
 3. The Highways Improvement Fund is shown in the statement prepared by the Provincial Auditor, and presented to the Legislative Assembly annually, pursuant to Section 9, Chapter 54, of The Highway Improvement Fund Act (R.S.O. 1927), and does not appear also in the Public Accounts. (See Sessional Paper No. 40, 1931.)
-

Mr. Bragg asked the following Question (No. 84):—

How much was paid by the Government during the last fiscal year for cutting and trimming trees on the King's Highways.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Highways replied as follows:—

\$25,975.74. Owing to an accident which occurred on the King's Highway, and caused the deaths of six persons, the Government decided to remove all the dead wood which bordered on the right-of-way.

Mr. Hipel asked the following Question (No. 90):—

1. What was the net cost to the Province for the building of the C.N.R. subway on No. 7 Highway near Breslau.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Highways replied as follows:—
\$33,620.57.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 5), An Act respecting the Central Canada Exhibition Association.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 18), An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 32), An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 35), An Act respecting the City of Welland.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 36), An Act respecting Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 38), An Act respecting the Toronto Harbour Commissioners.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 51), An Act to provide for Giving Threshers a Lien in Certain Cases, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The House then adjourned at 4.25 p.m.

THURSDAY, MARCH 16TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Price, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Fourth Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill without amendment:—

Bill (No. 39), An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 2), An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill (No. 6), An Act respecting the Sisters of St. Joseph for the Diocese of Toronto in Upper Canada.

Bill (No. 19), An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London.

Bill (No. 22), An Act respecting the Village of Forest Hill.

Bill (No. 29), An Act respecting the Town of Kenora.

Bill (No. 30), An Act respecting Havergal College.

Bill (No. 31), An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill (No. 19), "An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London," on the ground that it relates to a religious institution.

Ordered, That the fees, less the penalties and the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 19), "An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London," on the ground that it relates to a religious institution.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 103), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." *Mr. Murphy* (Beaches).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Amendment to the Motion for the consideration of the Speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario, at the opening of the Session, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time,

The Amendment to the Amendment "and this House begs to advise Your Honour that the present Government does not enjoy the confidence of the majority of the people of Ontario and is maladministrating the public affairs under the mandate given Mr. Ferguson in 1929. We advise therefore that only routine business of the House be carried out with all possible dispatch and that the Legislature should then forthwith be dissolved," having been put was lost on the following Division:—

YEAS

Baxter	Mackay	Ross
Blakelock	Medd	Sangster
Bragg	Munro	Simpson
Elliott	Murray	Sinclair
(Bruce, North)	McQuibban	Slack
Hipel	Newman	Taylor
Hutchinson	Nixon	Tweed—20

NAYS

Acres	Graham	Lyons
Aubin	Graves	Macaulay
Baird	Harcourt	Mahony
Berry	Harrison	Martin
Black	Heighington	(Hamilton)
Blanchard	Henry	Martin
Burt	(York, East)	(Brantford)
Calder	Henry	Monteith
Case	(Kent, East)	Moore
Challies	Hill	Morrison
Clark	Hogarth	Murphy
Colliver	Honeywell	(St. Patrick)
Cooke	Ireland	Murphy
Coté	Jamieson	(Beaches)
Craig	Jutten	McArthur
Davis	Kennedy	McBrien
Elliott	(Temiskaming)	McCrea
(Rainy River)	Kennedy	McLean
Ellis	(Peel)	McMillen
Finlayson	Kenning	McNaughton
Fraleigh	Lancaster	Oakley
Freele	Laughton	Poisson

NAYS—*Continued*

Price (Parkdale)	Seguin	Stedman
Price (York West)	Shaver	Strickland
Raven	Shields	Vaughan
Reid	Singer	Willson (Niagara Falls)
Richardson	Skinner	Wilson (Windsor, East)
Robb	Smith (Essex, South)	Wilson (Lincoln)
St. Denis	Smith (Greenwood)	Wright—81
Sanderson		
Scholfield	Spence	

PAIRS

Oliver	Bell
Robertson	Nesbitt

The Amendment to the Motion that "This House deplores reductions in grants to Ontario schools without the repeal of regulations requiring expensive standards of equipment, so that the taxpayers might absorb such reductions through other economies in education," having then been put, was lost on the same Division.

The main Motion, having been submitted, was then carried on the following Division:—

YEAS

Acres	Graves	Mahony
Aubin	Harcourt	Martin (Hamilton)
Baird	Harrison	Martin (Brantford)
Berry	Heighington	Monteith
Black	Henry (York, East)	Moore
Blanchard	Henry (Kent, East)	Morrison
Burt	Hill	Murphy (St. Patrick)
Calder	Hogarth	Murphy (Beaches)
Case	Honeywell	McArthur
Challies	Ireland	McBrien
Clark	Jamieson	McCrea
Colliver	Jutten	McLean
Cooke	Kennedy (Temiskaming)	McMillen
Coté	Kennedy (Peel)	McNaughton
Craig	Kenning	Oakley
Davis	Lancaster	Poisson
Elliott (Rainy River)	Laughton	Price (Parkdale)
Ellis	Lyons	
Finlayson	Macaulay	
Fraleigh		
Freele		
Graham		

YEAS—*Continued*

Price (York West)	Shaver	Strickland
Raven	Shields	Vaughan
Reid	Singer	Willson
Richardson	Skinner	(Niagara Falls)
Robb	Smith	Wilson
St. Denis	(Essex, South)	(Windsor, East)
Sanderson	Smith	Wilson
Schofield	(Greenwood)	(Lincoln)
Seguin	Spence	Wright—81.
	Stedman	

NAYS

Baxter	Mackay	Ross
Blakelock	Medd	Sangster
Bragg	Munro	Simpson
Elliott	Murray	Sinclair
(Bruce, North)	McQuibban	Slack
Hipel	Newman	Taylor
Hutchinson	Nixon	Tweed—20.

PAIRS

Bell	Oliver
Nesbitt	Robertson

And it was,

Resolved: That an humble Address be presented to The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario, as follows:—

*To The Honourable Herbert Alexander Bruce,
a Colonel in the Royal Army Medical Corps, F.R.C.S. (Eng.),
Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario.*

We, His Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

The Address, having been read the second time, was agreed to.

Ordered, That the Address be engrossed and presented to The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor by those Members of this House who are Members of the Executive Council.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 52), An Act respecting The Ontario Institute of Radio Therapy.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 77), An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 89), An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

FRIDAY, MARCH 17TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 104), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." *Mr. Baird.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 105), intituled "An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act." *Mr. Monteith.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 106), intituled "An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 107), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act." *Mr. McCrea.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

The following Bills were read the third time and were passed:—

Bill (No. 58), An Act to amend The Execution Act.

Bill (No. 69), An Act to amend The Northern Development Act.

Bill (No. 70), An Act to amend The Long Point Park Act.

Bill (No. 3), An Act respecting St. Patrick's Asylum of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 20), An Act respecting the Algoma Steel Corporation.

Bill (No. 28), An Act respecting the Town of Whitby.

Bill (No. 33), An Act to amend the Act incorporating Les Révérends Pères Oblats de L'Immaculée Conception de Marie.

Bill (No. 37) An Act respecting the Township of Teck.

Bill (No. 9), An Act to incorporate the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust.

Bill (No. 1), An Act respecting the Mutual Relief Life Insurance Company.

Bill (No. 16), An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Mr. Ross asked the following Question (No. 9):—

1. What has been the total cost occasioned by adverse exchange rates during each of the last three fiscal years to (a) the Government; (b) the Hydro-Electric Power Commission.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

(a) 1930.....	\$80,674	(b) 1930.....	\$464
1931.....	95,260	1931.....	95,389
1932.....	2,330,463	1932.....	1,952,531

Mr. Newman asked the following Question (No. 47):—

1. How much Crown timber land is held by private interest in Thunder Bay District. 2. What companies hold these lands. 3. How much in each case. 4. Have any leases been cancelled for non-payment of dues, etc. 5. Who are the lessees in default, and the amount in each case.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. Pulp Concessionaires:

Abitibi Power & Paper Company.....	3,430 square miles.
Fort William Paper Company, Ltd.....	1,822 "
Great Lakes Paper Company.....	5,740 "
Montreal Trust Company.....	400 "
Nipigon Corporation Ltd.....	1,568 "
North West Development Company.....	1,930 "
Provincial Paper Limited.....	2,656 "
Thunder Bay Paper Company.....	1,555 "

Total.....	19,111	"
------------	--------	---

Timber Licensees:

U. Aho.....	15	square miles.
Austin & Nicholson.....	90	"
R. Bell Estate.....	12	"
Central Paper Company.....	209 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
D. A. Clark.....	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
C. W. Cox.....	62	"
Alf. Cooper.....	$\frac{1}{2}$	"
Thos. Falls.....	217 $\frac{3}{4}$	"
John Fee.....	23	"
Fort William Forest Products.....	53	"
Fort William Tie & Timber Co., Ltd.....	9	"
Garden Lake Timber Company.....	128	"
J. J. Gracie.....	12	"
Estate of Jas. T. Greer.....	16 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
J. C. Greer.....	58	"
Alex. Grant.....	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
S. J. Hill & Company.....	1	"
George Johnson.....	8 $\frac{3}{4}$	"
Kallio & Nelson.....	1	"
Albert Lanktree.....	$\frac{1}{4}$	"
Peter A. Legrow.....	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
Mellor Timber Company.....	5	"
Chas. Mellor.....	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
Montreal Trust Company.....	58	"
A. McKinley.....	18	"
Russel McKechnie.....	27 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
Newaygo Company, Ltd.....	10 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
Newaygo Timber Company, Ltd.....	52	"
A. J. Paju.....	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
Pigeon River Lumber Company.....	8 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
Pigeon Timber Company, Ltd.....	307	"
Provincial Paper Limited.....	63	"
B. Renshaw & C. Duesing.....	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
Russell Timber Company, Ltd.....	$\frac{1}{2}$	"
K. C. Shaw.....	18	"
Shaw & Lahti.....	18	"
Superior Timber Company, Ltd.....	310 $\frac{1}{4}$	"
C. E. Spence.....	2	"
Total.....	1,867 $\frac{1}{2}$	square miles.

Note: Of the above-named licensees, all held licenses for last operating season of 1931-32, except four, with whom negotiations are under way towards renewal or abandonment.

2. Answered by No. 1. 3. Answered by No. 1. 4. No. 5. Not deemed advisable in public interest to answer this.

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 64):—

1. What amount of power was supplied to the Sudbury mining area by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario during the years 1930, 1931, 1932 and in 1933 to February 1st. 2. To whom was this power delivered and the amount to each company.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:

1. The amount of power sold by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in the Sudbury mining area during the various years requested was as follows:— 1930, 14,593.5 h.p.; 1931, 29,927.8 h.p.; 1932, 30,908.7 h.p.; January, 1933 to February 1st, 29,127.0 h.p.

2. Power was sold to various companies during the various years as follows:

Calendar Year	Treadwell Yukon Mining Co.	C.N.R.	Falconbridge Nickel Co.	Int'l. Nickel Co., 60 Cycle	Int'l. Nickel Co., 25 Cycle	Sudbury	Burwash Prison Farm	Sudbury St. Ry.
1930.....	2,000	1,794.0	4,825.7	4,900.8	120.0	953.0
1931.....	2,000	1,754.6	4,161.2	16,000	5,088.5	130.0	793.5
1932.....	2,000	3,083.0	4,161.2	16,000	5,088.5	126.0	450.0
Jan., 1933- Feb. 1st...	261.4	3,112.6	4,161.2	16,000	5,088.5	94.5	408.8

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 65):—

1. What amount of power was supplied to the Sudbury mining area by the Ontario Power Service Corporation during 1932 and in 1933 to February 1st. 2. To whom was it supplied.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. In 1932, none, but the Hydro-Electric Power sold from power delivered through the contract with the Ontario Power Service Corporation 16,000 h.p. In 1933, none, but the Hydro-Electric Power Commission sold 16,000 h.p. 2. Power was supplied through the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario to the International Nickel Company.

Mr. Sangster asked the following Question (No. 69):—

1. Were any Government funds used in the erection of the Midland artificial rink. 2. If so, what amount.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. No. 2. Answered by the reply to No. 1.
-

Mr. Medd asked the following Question (No. 73):—

1. Did the Government have a portrait painted of the Honourable William Donald Ross, former Lieutenant-Governor. 2. If so, what artist did the work. 3. Did other artists in Ontario have an opportunity to compete for this work. 4. Was the work given by Order-in-Council, or were the instructions from a Minister. 5. If from a Minister, what Minister of the Crown gave the order and did he have an estimate of the total cost. 6. What has been the total cost to the Province to have this portrait painted and hung. 7. What was the cost of painting and hanging the portraits of each of the last three Lieutenant-Governors prior to Honourable W. D. Ross.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. It is customary to have a portrait of the retiring Lieutenant-Governor painted for the historical collection at Government House. Therefore, the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Government, intimated to the Honourable W. D. Ross, then Lieutenant-Governor, that the Government would be pleased to have a portrait of him painted. The usual custom of having His Honour choose his own artist was followed. 2. Mr. John Russell. 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1. 5. Answered by No. 1. No estimate, under the circumstances, was asked. 6. \$5,000. 7. Honourable John S. Hendrie, \$785.00. Honourable Lionel H. Clarke, \$1,050.00. Colonel the Honourable Henry Cockshutt, \$1,000.00.

Mr. Murray asked the following Question (No. 75):—

1. How many Crown Forests Reserves have been created under The Forestry Act. 2. When were they created. 3. What is the area of such each reserve.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. None. 2 and 3. See answer to No. 1. Several tracts of land have been set aside as Provincial Forests under The Provincial Forests Act, 1929, 19 Geo. V, Cap. 14. For description and area of each see Schedule "A" of said Act.

Mr. Murray asked the following Question (No. 77):—

1. Who are the members of the Forestry Board provided for in Section 16 of The Forestry Act. 2. What was its cost to the Province in each of the years since its creation in the matter of (a) salaries; (b) administration.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. J. A. Gillies, Lumberman, Braeside, Ontario; Dr. C. D. Howe, Dean of Faculty of Forestry, University of Toronto, Toronto; B. F. Avery, M.F., Forester, Sault Ste. Marie; H. G. Schanche, B.Sc.F., Forester, Iroquois Falls; E. J. Zavitz, B.A., M.S.F., Deputy Minister of Forestry, Toronto. 2. (a) Nil. (b) 1927, \$810.10; 1928, \$726.40; 1929, \$224.35; 1930, \$159.75; 1931, nil; 1932, nil.

Mr. Murray asked the following Question (No. 82):—

1. How many square miles of Crown land held under license, lease, or permit for the cutting of timber or pulpwood have been cancelled or surrendered to the Crown under the provisions of The Forestry Act. 2. How many square miles of timber or pulpwood land have been licensed, leased or permitted in consideration of the above cancellations or surrenders. 3. How much money has been paid by the Crown in consideration of the above cancellations or surrenders. 4. What, if any, other valuable consideration has been granted by the Crown with respect to the above cancellations or surrenders.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. 692½ square miles have been surrendered to Crown and set apart as Provincial Forests and incorporated in Schedule "A," 19 Geo. V, Cap. 14. 2. None. 3. None. 4. Of the area mentioned in answer No. 1, 325¾ square miles were surrendered by one company, and the balance by another company. Each of these companies had been a successful tenderer on certain timber sold under public competition, the conditions of which required collateral or a performance guarantee in the way of cash and bonds, all returnable on fulfilment of obligations. In lieu of surrender the cash collateral was reduced in each case, but guarantee company and personal bonds insisted upon.

Mr. Robertson asked the following Question (No. 85):—

How much was paid by the Government during the last fiscal year for cutting grass and weeds on the King's Highways.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

\$94,850.44. Calendar year figures are given as municipal statements are prepared for these periods.

Mr. Oliver asked the following Question (No. 87):—

1. Were the Agricultural Representatives called into conference at the O.A.C. in December of 1932. 2. What was the total cost of holding this conference. 3. Were representatives of the Canadian Packers also present at this conference. 4. What proportion of the cost was borne by the Canadian Packers.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. \$417.35. 3. Yes, for part of the time. 4. No expenses paid by Government for other than officials.

Mr. Bragg asked the following Question (No. 92):—

1. When was the King's Highway No. 30 from Brighton to Campbellford taken over as a Provincial Highway. 2. What has been the total cost to date to the Government for all purposes in connection with said Highway, including construction and maintenance.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

1. 9th July, 1930. 2. \$281,103.96.

On motion of Mr. Simpson, seconded by Mr. Sinclair,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing the following information: 1. Were tenders called for the construction of the Criminal Insane Hospital at Penetang. 2. If so, what firms tendered on the work. 3. What were the prices received from each firm. 4. Who received the contract for the construction of the building. 5. What was the price of said tender. 6. Was the building erected on the original plans and specifications. 7. Who was the inspector who supervised the construction of the Hospital for Criminal Insane at Penetang. 8. What remuneration was he paid. 9. Was the brickwork of said building carried to the height provided in the specifications and plans. 10. If no, why not. 11. Were tenders asked for separately for (1) heating, (2) plumbing for the Hospital for the Criminal Insane at Penetang. 12. What firms tendered and what were the amounts of each tender. 13. What extra charges were made by, and allowed to, firms who received the contracts. 14. Were repairs required to be done or alterations made on the plumbing or heating after the same had been accepted by the Government from the contractor. 15. If so, who did it. 16. What was the cost of such repairs and alterations.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 90), An Act to amend The Public Schools Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 91), An Act to amend The Adolescent School Attendance Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 92), An Act to amend The High Schools Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 97), An Act to amend The Municipal Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 2), An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 6), An Act respecting the Sisters of St. Joseph for the Diocese of Toronto in Upper Canada.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 19), An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 22), An Act respecting the Village of Forest Hill.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 29), An Act respecting the Town of Kenora.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 30), An Act respecting Havergal College.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 31), An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 39), An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 5), An Act respecting the Central Canada Exhibition Association.

Bill (No. 18), An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall.

Bill (No. 32), An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 35), An Act respecting the City of Welland.

Bill (No. 36), An Act respecting Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa.

Bill (No. 38), An Act respecting the Toronto Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without Amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time on Monday next.

The House then adjourned at 5.10 p.m.

MONDAY, MARCH 20TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. McCrea,

Resolved, That this House will on Thursday next resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. McCrea,

Resolved, That this House will on Thursday next resolve itself into the Committee on Ways and Means.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 108), intituled "An Act to amend The Medical Act." *Mr. Nesbitt.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 109), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Health Act." *Mr. Robb.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 110), intituled "The Relief Land Settlement Act." *Mr. Finlayson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 111), intituled "An Act to extend the time for Commencement of Actions for Simple Contract Debts." *Mr. Robertson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 2), An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill (No. 6), An Act respecting the Sisters of St. Joseph for the Diocese of Toronto in Upper Canada.

Bill (No. 19), An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London.

Bill (No. 22), An Act respecting the Village of Forest Hill.

Bill (No. 29), An Act respecting the Town of Kenora.

Bill (No. 30), An Act respecting Havergal College.

Bill (No. 31), An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Bill (No. 39), An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without Amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-morrow.

Mr. Baxter asked the following Question (No. 55):—

1. What buildings in the City of Toronto are owned by the Government of Ontario. 2. What has been the total cost of constructing or purchasing the same.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. Parliament Buildings, East Block, Osgoode Hall, Government House, Normal School, Ontario Hospital, 999 Queen Street West; Mercer Reformatory, 110 University Avenue, McMaster University property; No. 1 Queen's Park, No. 5 Queen's Park, No. 7 Queen's Park, No. 9 Queen's Park, No. 11 Queen's Park, No. 15 Queen's Park, Garage, rear of No. 15 Queen's Park; No. 39 Queen's Park, No. 43 Queen's Park, No. 47 Queen's Park, No. 112 College Street, Police Garage, 621 Jarvis Street, Experimental Station, Stanley Park; 128 Pembroke Street. 2. \$11,883,172.98.

Note: The difference between the balance as of 31st October, 1932, shown on the above statement and the amount shown in the statement of the Commission's investments of \$119,532.38 is due to the fact that these bonds are carried on the books of the Commission at the market value at date of their being placed in the Reserves.

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 101):—

1. What revenue accrued to the Niagara System of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission by the sale of power to the Canada Niagara Power Company as mentioned on page IX of the Annual Report, 1931. 2. What revenue accrued for the sale of the same in the fiscal year 1932.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1.—

Period April 1, 1926, to October 31, 1931

Fiscal Year ending October 31st	Revenue from Sale of Power to Canadian Niagara Power Company	Export Tax Paid	Net Revenue accrued to Niagara System
1926 (from April 1)	\$530,790.30	\$64,547.23	\$466,243.07
1927	1,397,186.00	162,713.43	1,234,472.57
1928	1,187,174.21	139,428.80	1,047,745.41
1929	798,845.03	94,728.56	704,116.47
1930	906,274.50	107,839.19	798,435.31
1931	542,920.85	77,607.79	465,313.06
	\$5,363,190.89	\$646,865.00	\$4,716,325.89
2.—			
1932 (November 1, 1931, to March 31, 1932) . .	\$741.40	\$109.54	\$631.86
After March 31, 1932 . .	None		

Mr. Mackay asked the following Question (No. 106):—

1. Is Ernest Westbury, former Reeve of York Township, now in the employ of the Ontario Government. 2. If so, in what capacity. 3. What was the date of his appointment. 4. What is his salary.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. No. 2, 3, 4, answered by No. 1.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 66), An Act to amend The Election Act.

Referred to the Select Committee of this House appointed to consider the best means of improving the Method of preparing the Voters Lists on which the Provincial Elections are held.

Bill (No. 93), An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 95), An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Law.

Bill (No. 99), An Act to amend The Innkeepers Act.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 96), An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Public Service Superannuation Board, Ontario, for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 41.*)

Also, Statement showing all sums credited to The Highway Improvement Fund and all sums chargeable thereto for the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 42.*)

Also, Return to an Order dated 17th March, 1933, That there be laid before the House a Return showing the following information: 1. Were tenders called for the construction of the Criminal Insane Hospital at Penetang. 2. If so, what firms tendered on the work. 3. What were the prices received from each firm. 4. Who received the contract for the construction of the building. 5. What was the price of said tender. 6. Was the building erected on the original plans and specifications. 7. Who was the inspector who supervised the construction

of the Hospital for Criminal Insane at Penetang. 8. What remuneration was he paid. 9. Was the brickwork of said building carried to the height provided in the specifications and plans. 10. If no, why not. 11. Were tenders asked for separately for (1) heating, (2) plumbing for the Hospital for the Criminal Insane at Penetang. 12. What firms tendered and what were the amounts of each tender. 13. What extra charges were made by, and allowed to, firms who received the contracts. 14. Were repairs required to be done or alterations made on the plumbing or heating after the same had been accepted by the Government from the contractor. 15. If so, who did it. 16. What was the cost of such repairs and alterations. (*Sessional Papers No. 43.*)

The House then adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

TUESDAY, MARCH 21ST, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Price, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Fifth Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills without amendment:—

Bill (No. 11), An Act respecting the Town of Niagara.

Bill (No. 41), An Act respecting the amalgamation of Toronto East General Hospital and Toronto Orthopedic Hospital.

Bill (No. 46), An Act respecting the Township of Crowland.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 24), An Act respecting the Township of East York.

Bill (No. 44), An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees, less the penalties and the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 41), "An Act respecting the amalgamation of Toronto East General Hospital and Toronto Orthopedic Hospital," on the ground that it relates to a charitable institution.

Ordered, That the fees, less the penalties and the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill (No. 41), "An Act respecting the amalgamation of Toronto East General Hospital and Toronto Orthopedic Hospital," on the ground that it relates to a charitable institution.

The following Bills were read the third time and were passed:—

Bill (No. 84), An Act to amend The Registration of Nurses Act.

Bill (No. 86), An Act to amend The Theatres and Cinematographs Act.

Bill (No. 5), An Act respecting the Central Canada Exhibition Association.

Bill (No. 18), An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall.

Bill (No. 32), An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 35), An Act respecting the City of Welland.

Bill (No. 36), An Act respecting Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa.

Bill (No. 38), An Act respecting the Toronto Harbour Commissioners.

Bill (No. 2), An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill (No. 6), An Act respecting the Sisters of St. Joseph for the Diocese of Toronto in Upper Canada.

Bill (No. 19), An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London.

Bill (No. 22), An Act respecting the Village of Forest Hill.

Bill (No. 29), An Act respecting the Town of Kenora.

Bill (No. 30), An Act respecting Havergal College.

Bill (No. 31), An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Bill (No. 39), An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 94), An Act to amend The Old Age Pensions Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 100), The Nursery Stock Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 105), An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 49), The Mortgageors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1933.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

On motion of Mr. Murphy (St. Patrick), seconded by Mr. Heighington,

That a Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into an alleged insult and libel upon a Member of this Assembly by one Gordon Waldron, Esq., K.C., of Toronto, contrary to Section 54 (1) A of The Legislative Assembly Act and bring in a report for such action by this Legislature as may be deemed expedient.

The motion of Mr. Murphy was, with the consent of the House, withdrawn.

With the consent of the House, on motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That a Select Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into and report to this House upon the matters hereinafter set forth, viz:—

The statement contained in the Toronto Daily Star in its issue of March 10th, that one Gordon Waldron, K.C., is reputed to have said and charged as follows:—

"If you ask me to state my convictions, I would say that he is being paid to promote that bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country, exposing himself, I think, to criminal prosecution."

The said statement and charge refer to a certain Bill introduced in the House by the Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick in the City of Toronto on March 6th, 1933, being Bill (No. 82), entitled "An Act to repeal The Optometry Act, 1931."

The said statement and charge by the said Gordon Waldron charge the said Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick with a contravention of Section 49 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

The said statement and charge being, unless substantiated, a contravention of Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act on the part of the said Gordon Waldron the matter is referred for investigation by the said Select Committee and for the said purpose the said Committee shall have full power and authority to call for persons, papers, and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth hereby command and compel the attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the said Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings or

deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

The Select Committee to be composed as follows:—

Honourable Mr. McCrea (Chairman), *Messrs. Hill, Richardson, Smith* (Essex), *Taylor, Tweed and Wilson* (Windsor).

The House then adjourned at 6.20 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22ND, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Ross asked the following Question (No. 42):—

1. How many (a) permanent employees; (b) temporary and occasional employees were there in Ontario in the Department of Colonization and Immigration during each of the last three fiscal years. 2. How many (a) permanent employees; (b) temporary and occasional employees were there in England or elsewhere outside Ontario in this Department during each of the last three fiscal years. 3. What was (a) the wage bill; (b) total expenditure for maintaining this work in England or elsewhere outside Ontario in each of the last three fiscal years. 4. How many immigrants has this Department been responsible for bringing into Ontario during each of the last three fiscal years.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

1. (a) 1929-1930.....	10	(b) 1929-1930.....	15
1930-1931.....	13	1930-1931.....	10
1931-1932.....	3	1931-1932.....	1

2. (a) 1929-1930.....	16	(b) 1929-1930.....	8
1930-1931.....	16	1930-1931.....	7
1931-1932.....	13	1931-1932.....	2

This includes officials of Ontario House.

3. (a) 1929-1930.....	\$31,748.99	(b) 1929-1930.....	\$86,308.48
1930-1931.....	30,853.51	1930-1931.....	69,895.42
1931-1932.....	28,775.00	1931-1932.....	55,412.24

This includes salaries and expenses of Ontario House.

4. 1929-1930.....	341
1930-1931.....	31
1931-1932.....	None

Mr. Baxter asked the following Question (No. 102):—

1. How much was spent by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission during the last fiscal year on publicity. 2. What form did the publicity take for which said money was expended.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario in the past fiscal year has made no expenditures for direct publicity. For indirect publicity, it may be explained that various members of the Commission's staff normally employed on other departmental work devote, as occasion requires throughout the year, portions of their time to the preparation of material which is used for the information of the co-operating municipalities and of the public. Such work consists of the preparation of the material for, and publication of, the Annual Report; "The Bulletin," issued monthly by the Commission for the information chiefly of the officials of the municipal Hydro utilities; and various special statements relating to matters affecting the welfare of the undertaking. From time to time it is necessary to correct misunderstandings or misrepresentations respecting the work of the Commission as was the case, for example, in the recently issued publication relating to rural electrical service in Ontario. There are special compilations made for standard works of financial and engineering reference. The Commission also publishes pamphlets descriptive of its work and power developments. These are printed at intervals as required. Distribution is made to educational, engineering, chemical, municipal and other conventions visiting the Province and the plants of the Commission. These features of the Commission's work are mentioned as representative of the kinds of efforts made in order to keep the public informed upon its various activities and in this respect constitute publicity of an indirect character. The yearly cost of publishing the various reports and pamphlets of the Commission amounts to:—

Printing, postage, art work, etc.....	\$12,427.96
Salary distribution.....	16,228.55
	<hr/>
	\$28,656.51
	<hr/>

2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. Tweed asked the following Question (No. 103):—

1. What was the total cost for the year 1932 to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of the publication known as "The Bulletin." 2. What number of subscribers paid the annual subscription fee of \$2.00 for this publication. 3. What number of copies of "The Bulletin" were published. 4. On whose authority is "The Bulletin" published. 5. To what account is the cost of "The Bulletin" charged.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1.—Printing and art work.....	\$3,940.23
Postage and sundries.....	595.18
Commission's cost.....	1,391.17
	<hr/>
	\$5,926.58
Less revenue.....	110.60
	<hr/>
	<u>\$5,815.98</u>

2. Municipalities' representatives free and 55 paid subscriptions. 3. 40,750 copies (average 3,396 monthly). 4. Hydro-Electric Power Commission. 5. Operation.

Mr. Simpson asked the following Question (No. 107):—

How many foreclosures of mortgages have been made by the Agricultural Development Board during the last two fiscal years.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

The Board does not make foreclosures but 154 properties have been taken over during the past two fiscal years as a result of either sale proceedings or quit claim deeds.

Mr. Mackay asked the following Question (No. 109):—

1. Is the residence and administration building at the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph completed. 2. What has been the total cost to date in erecting and furnishing this building. 3. Are all the costs paid in full. If not, how much is there yet to pay. 4. What has been the total cost of the central heating plant. Are all costs in this connection paid. If not, how much is there still to pay.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. \$975,097.53. 3. No. Final payments of \$1,726.61 due contractors. 4. \$141,298.17. All costs paid.

On motion of Mr. Finlayson, seconded by Mr. McCrea,

Ordered. That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee to consider a certain proposed Resolution respecting the setting apart out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000.00) and that the same shall be Applied for the purposes set out in The Northern Development Act and The Returned Soldiers' and Sailors' Land Settlement Act, or any of them.

Mr. Henry (York East) acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee)

Resolved, "That in addition to the amounts provided by The Northern Ontario Appropriation Acts, heretofore enacted, there shall be set apart out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000.00) and the same shall be applied for the purposes set out in The Northern Development Act and The Returned Soldiers' and Sailors' Land Settlement Act, or any of them."

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, that the Committee had come to a certain Resolution.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Resolved, "That in addition to the amounts provided by The Northern Ontario Appropriation Acts, heretofore enacted, there shall be set apart out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000.00) and the same shall be applied for the purposes set out in The Northern Development Act and The Returned Soldiers' and Sailors' Land Settlement Act, or any of them."

The Resolution, having been read the second time, was agreed to, and referred to the House on Bill (No. 102).

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 78), An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

Bill (No. 50), An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 104), An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 111), An Act to extend the time for Commencement of Actions for Simple Contract Debts.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

Bill (No. 11), An Act respecting the Town of Niagara.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 41), An Act respecting the Toronto East General Hospital and Toronto Orthopedic Hospital.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 46), An Act respecting the Township of Crowland.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 24), An Act respecting the Township of East York.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 44), An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 102), The Northern Ontario Appropriation Act, 1933.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 107), An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

On motion of Mr. Simpson, seconded by Mr. Bragg,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House, a Return showing: 1. Copies of all correspondence relating to agreements between the Government and the Trenton Cold Storage Company, Limited. 2. Full particulars regarding any loan of money made by the Government to the Trenton Cold Storage Company, Limited. 3. Full particulars relating to any lease of space by the Government from the Trenton Cold Storage Company, Limited.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Inspector of Legal Offices for year ending December 31, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 5.*)

Also, Report of the Department of Labour, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 10.*)

Also, Report on Operations under The Northern Development Act and The Colonization Roads Act for year ending October 31, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 30.*)

The House then adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

THURSDAY, MARCH 23RD, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Price, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Sixth Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills without amendment:—

Bill (No. 12), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 17), An Act respecting The Canadian Transit Company.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 4), An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Bill (No. 15), An Act respecting the Town of Sandwich.

Bill (No. 48), An Act respecting the Town of Kenora and The Keewatin Power Company, Limited.

Mr. Challies presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Public Accounts of the Province of Ontario for the twelve months ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 1.*)

Ordered, That the Public Accounts of the Province be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Henry delivered to Mr. Speaker a message from the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by himself; and the said message was read by Mr. Speaker, and is as follows:—

HERBERT ALEXANDER BRUCE

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits Supplementary Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the year ending October 31st, 1933, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
Toronto, March 23rd, 1933.

(*Sessional Papers No. 2.*)

Ordered, That the message of the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the Estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

The Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of Supply having been read,

Mr. Henry (York East) moved,

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

And a Debate having ensued, it was, on the motion of Mr. Elliott (North Bruce),

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 109), An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 110), The Relief Land Settlement Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 83), An Act to amend The Medical Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Lyons reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 52), An Act respecting The Ontario Institute of Radio Therapy, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Lyons reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 77), An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, and, after some time spent therein,

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Lyons reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 94), An Act to amend The Old Age Pensions Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Lyons reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 100), The Nursery Stock Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Lyons reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 107), An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Lyons reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

FRIDAY, MARCH 24TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 112), intituled "An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act."
Mr. Henry (York East).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. Hipel asked the following Question (No. 28):—

1. What was the total amount of outstanding accounts payable by the Province as at October 31st, 1932. 2. What amount was past due.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. \$373,973.14, as per statement of accounts payable on page 47, Public Accounts. 2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. Murray asked the following Question (No. 78):—

1. How many square miles of pulpwood limits or concessions are at present held by the Abitibi Power and Paper Company or its receiver or liquidator of any of its subsidiaries under license, lease, or permit from the Crown. 2. How many square miles of pulpwood limits or concessions formerly held by the above have been cancelled or have expired during the past five years. 3. How many square miles of pulpwood limits or concessions claimed by the above under license, lease, or permit from the Crown are at present in default. 4. What sum of money has accrued to the Crown with respect to all licenses, leases, or permits to cut pulpwood on the lands of the Crown by the above during each of the past five years. 5. What sum of money is now due the Crown from the above.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1.—	Name	Area
		square miles
	Abitibi Pulp Limit.....	1,560
	Additional Area.....	2,466
	Mattagami Pulp Limit, acquired from Abitibi Fibre Company, Limited.....	812
	G.T.P. Blocks 1 to 10 (jackpine only), pulpwood acquired from railway company.....	992 $\frac{1}{4}$
		"

Name	Area
Sault Ste. Marie Limit, acquired from Lake Superior Pulp & Paper Company.....	7,184 $\frac{1}{2}$ square miles
Spanish River Concession.....	3,627 "
" " Addition, acquired from Spanish River Pulp & Paper Company, Limited.....	3,066 "
Sturgeon Falls Pulp Concession, acquired from Spanish River Pulp & Paper Company, Limited.....	2,369 "
	<hr/> 22,076 $\frac{3}{4}$ "

Pulp Concessions of Company's Subsidiaries

Fort William Paper Company:	
Area northwest of Lake Nipigon.....	1,822 square miles
Thunder Bay Paper Company:	
Area northeast of Lake Nipigon.....	1,555 "
Provincial Paper Mills:	
Nipigon Pulp Limit.....	1,240 "
Area south and west of Lake Nipigon.....	1,416 "
	<hr/> 6,033 "

Licensed Areas

Berth "Z.C.".....	28 square miles
" "Z.D.".....	39 "
Area adjacent to Berth "Z.D.".....	2 "
Berth M-2.....	7 "
Township 25, Range 22, District of Algoma.....	42 "
Beniah and parts of Townships Menapia and Thorning..	155 "
Part Simpson Township.....	58 "
Township St. Louis.....	36 "
Township Hawkins.....	81 "
	<hr/> 448 "

Licensed Area of Subsidiaries

Provincial Paper Limited:	
Sibley Township.....	63 square miles
Total.....	<hr/> 28,620 $\frac{3}{4}$ "

2.—

Sault Ste. Marie Pulp Limit, expired June 1st, 1932.....	7,184 $\frac{1}{2}$ square miles
Spanish River Pulp Concession, expired October 1st, 1930	3,627 "
Sturgeon Falls Pulp Concession, expired April 1st, 1932..	2,369 "
Total.....	<hr/> 13,140 $\frac{1}{2}$ "

Due to the generally depressed and somewhat complicated situation of the newsprint industry the question of renewals has been held in abeyance.

3. World-wide adverse trade and industrial conditions have necessitated the closing of certain mills and the reducing of production in others. Pending a return to conditions approaching normal, it is considered advisable in the public interest that no drastic action be taken that might accentuate the present disturbance. Efforts towards restoring normal conditions will not be abated.

4.—

1928-29.....	\$ 407,104.43
1929-30.....	870,356.19
1930-31.....	243,395.64
1931-32.....	125,760.51
1932-33.....	162,890.86
	<u>\$1,809,507.63</u>

5. No charges owing except those covered by a disputed account (amounting to one per cent. of total accruals referred in Answer to No. 4) against one of the companies which at present is the subject of negotiations towards adjustment.

Mr. Murray asked the following Question (No. 83):—

1. How many licenses, leases, or permits are at present in effect with respect to timber or/and pulpwood lands in Algonquin Park. 2. In whose names are the above licenses, leases, or permits registered, and how many square miles are held by each person or corporation. 3. What is the total area in square miles held under timber or/and pulpwood licenses, lease, or permits within the borders of Algonquin Park. 4. What sum of money has accrued to the Crown for each of the past five years on account of the above licenses, leases, or permits.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1.—

Timber Licensees

Name	No. of Licenses	Area
J. R. Booth, Limited.....	20	395 square miles
Gertrude E. Booth.....	3	39½ "
Bronson Company, Limited.....	2	24 "
Clark, Howe, Waters & Knight Bros.....	4	74½ "
P. A. Duff.....	1	17¼ "
Fassett Lumber Corporation, Limited.....	2	24 "
Golden Lake Lumber Company.....	7	172½ "
Gillies Bros., Limited.....	5	241 "
Hawkesbury Lumber Company, Limited.....	9	261 "

Name	No. of Licenses		Area square miles
Merchants Bank of Canada.....	1	24	
Merchants Bank of Canada for Hull Lumber Com- pany and R. T. Ritchie.....	1	39	"
McLachlin Bros., Limited.....	10	219½	"
J. S. L. McRae.....	2	113	"
Pembroke Shook Mills.....	1	21	"
Remus Bros.....	1	4	"
Standard Chemical Company, Limited.....	1	57	"
Sterling Lumber Company, Limited.....	1	5¼	"
Total.....	71	1,731½	"

2. Answered by No. 1. 3. Answered by No. 1.

4.—

1927-28.....	\$ 116,437.91
1928-29.....	141,370.57
1929-30.....	197,816.45
1930-31.....	111,096.59
1931-32.....	51,398.18
	<u>\$ 618,119.70</u>

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 86):—

1. How many companies have in each of the years 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932 filed the statements required by Section 3 of The Pulpwood Conservation Act, 1929. 2. How many applications for extension of time for filing such statements have been made by companies as provided in Section 4 of said Act. 3. How many such extensions have been granted. 4. How many nurseries have been established as provided in Section 7 of said Act for supplying spruce and pulpwoods to companies for planting. 5. What townships, berths or locations have been set apart for companies for reforestation purposes. 6. What amount has been collected from companies for the purposes of said Act as provided in Section 9 of said Act. 7. What amount of money has been spent by the Government under the provisions of said Act, including any amount collected from companies. 8. How many companies made the returns in each year since the passing of said Act as provided in Section 10 of said Act.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. For 1929, 85. Section 3, limited requirement to 1929. 2. Nine. 3. Nine. 4. None. 5. None. 6. Nil. 7. Nil. 8. During organization years 1929 and 1930, 85. 1931, 62. 1932, 65.

Mr. Newman asked the following Question (No. 104):—

1. What number were accused of drunkenness before the Courts of Ontario in each of the years 1926 and 1932. 2. What number of these were dismissed

as first offenders and what number were sentenced. 3. What was the number of convictions for indictable offences in Ontario in each of the years 1926, 1930 and 1932. 4. How many convictions were made in each of the years 1926, 1929 and 1932 for driving while drunk, for reckless driving, and for exceeding the speed limit.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. Accused of drunkenness in 1926, 14,561; in 1932, 8,541. 2. In 1926, 809 dismissed, 13,752 convicted; in 1932, 475 dismissed, 8,066 convicted. 3. Indictable offences in 1926, 7,248; in 1930, 11,774; in 1932, 10,832. 4. Convictions for drunk driving, in 1926, 469; in 1929, 722; in 1932, 431. Convictions for reckless driving, in 1926, 2,355; in 1929, 3,258; in 1932, 4,162. Convictions for speeding, in 1926, 16,381; in 1929, 18,043; in 1932, 19,606.

Mr. Mackay asked the following Question (No. 108):—

1. Is there an organization known as the Agricultural Advisory Committee. 2. If so, what are the activities or duties of this Committee. 3. How often has it met. 4. What recommendations or other results have come from this Committee. 5. What has been the total cost to the Province in connection with this Committee. 6. Has the Province paid all expenses or has part been borne by the Counties. 7. Are any salaries or honorariums paid by the Province for secretarial or other purposes.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

1. No, but there is an Ontario Agricultural Council composed of one Representative from each Agricultural Committee of the County Councils. 2. The duties of this Council are to aid the farming industry of the Province. 3. Twice. 4. A number of recommendations have been made by the Council which will be given consideration. 5. The Council received a grant of \$500.00 for the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932. 6. Part of the expenses has been borne by the Counties. 7. No.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 103), An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 4), An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 12), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 15), An Act respecting the Town of Sandwich.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 17), An Act respecting the Canadian Transit Company.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 48), An Act respecting the Town of Kenora and The Keewatin Power Company, Limited.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 106), An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 11), An Act respecting the Town of Niagara.

Bill (No. 41), An Act respecting the Toronto East General Hospital and Toronto Orthopedic Hospital.

Bill (No. 46), An Act respecting the Township of Crowland.

Bill (No. 24), An Act respecting the Township of East York.

Bill (No. 44), An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 89), An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report progress, and directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 105), An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act, and, after some

time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the Amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 109), An Act to amend The Public Health Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 110), The Relief Land Settlement Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House then adjourned at 4.00 p.m.

MONDAY, MARCH 27TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That beginning on Wednesday next and on each succeeding Friday and Wednesday for the remainder of the Session Government business shall be placed on the Order Paper.

On motion of Mr. Acres, seconded by Mr. Raven,

Ordered, That Rule No. 56 of this House be suspended to permit the introduction of a Bill to amend The Assessment Act.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 113), intituled "An Act to amend The Cemetery Act, 1931." *Mr. Davis.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 114), intituled "An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 115), intituled "An Act to amend The Stenographic Reporters' Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 116), intituled "An Act to amend The Assessment Act." *Mr. Acres.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Mr. Medd asked the following Question (No. 43):—

1. How many (a) permanent employees; (b) temporary employees and occasional employees were on the staff of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario during each of the last three fiscal years. (c) What was the total wage bill for each year. 2. What was the salary of (a) Mr. F. A. Gaby; (b) Mr. W. W. Pope; (c) Mr. I. B. Lucas. (d) What was the date of the last increase in salary and the amount of the increase in each instance.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. (a) Permanent employees as of October 31st, exclusive of Dominion Power and Transmission Company properties: 1930, 2,613; 1931, 2,782; 1932, 2,656. (b) Temporary and occasional employees as of October 31st, exclusive of Dominion Power and Transmission Company properties: 1930, 3,613; 1931, 1,587; 1932, 1,057. (c) Total wage bill for each fiscal year, exclusive of Dominion Power and Transmission Company properties: 1930, \$8,979,148.85; 1931, \$8,170,501.66; 1932, \$6,270,102.76. 2. The salaries paid to the officials of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission are wholly within the control of the Commission, which, under The Power Commission Act, 1927, Section 7, may distribute and apportion such salaries, and its decision shall be final. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission is engaged in a commercial undertaking and the Legislative Assembly having given these powers to the Commission, the Government does not believe it is in the best interest of the work entrusted to the Commission, nor in the interest of the municipalities, to publicly disclose the salaries of its employees.

Mr. Medd asked the following Question (No. 74):—

1. What is the present salary of each of the following officials on the staff of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission: Dr. T. H. Hogg, Chief Hydraulic Engineer; E. T. J. Brandon, Chief Electric Engineer; R. T. Jeffrey, Chief Municipal Engineer; W. R. Robertson, Chief of the Railway Division; H. C. Don Carlos, Chief Operating Engineer; W. G. Pierdon, Chief Accountant; A. E. Davidson, Chief of Transmission and Distribution; W. P. Dobson, Chief of Testing and Research Department. 2. When did each of these officials receive their last increase in salary and what was the amount of increase in each instance.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1 and 2. The salaries paid to the officials of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission are wholly within the control of the Commission, which, under The Power Commission Act, 1927, Section 7, may distribute and apportion such salaries, and its decision shall be final. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission is engaged in a commercial undertaking and the Legislative Assembly, having given these powers to the Commission, the Government does not believe it is in the best interest of the work entrusted to the Commission, nor in the interest of the municipalities, to publicly disclose the salaries of its employees.

Mr. Simpson asked the following Question (No. 97):—

1. What was the total cost of the short-wave experimental radio stations of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission during the last fiscal year. 2. For what purpose are these stations maintained and operated. 3. How many of these stations are in operation.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. At present the Commission has no actual station rated as a short-wave experimental radio station. The Commission has obtained a license for such an experimental station, and any one of its three short-wave private commercial radio stations could be adjusted to operate under this license if difficulty were experienced in maintaining communication on the regular wave length of the station. During the past year it was not necessary to make use of this experimental short-wave radio license. Prior to March 31st, 1932, the three stations now operated under private commercial radio licenses were operated under licenses for short-wave experimental radio stations. In answering the question regarding total cost, the cost of these three stations is given for the complete fiscal year, whether operated under the experimental or commercial licenses. The cost of operating and maintaining the three radio stations for the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, was \$1,150.99. The fixed charges including depreciation, interest and sinking fund amounted to \$446.51; the total cost was \$1,597.50. 2. The Commission maintains a central technical staff constantly communicating with the field staff and supervising operation. Hence it is necessary to provide means of communication between the administrative office and

the field plants. In most cases the private telephone system used for operation is connected with the administrative office, but this is not practicable for Cameron Falls and Ear Falls, due to their remote location. For this reason, short-wave radio stations have been established at the generating stations mentioned and a corresponding station at the administrative office in Toronto. At Ear Falls the nearest telegraph station and railway station is 70 miles distant from the powerhouse. There are only two mail deliveries per week between the railway station and the post-office nearest to the powerhouse, and for some weeks during the spring and fall there is no mail communication whatever. Should the operators at the plant require repair parts, technical advice or instructions, service might be seriously affected if means of prompt communication were not available. At Cameron Falls the nearest telegraph station is at Nipigon, but there was no telegraph operator at that station when the Commission's radio station was installed. Communication by mail with Toronto office is slow, due to the distance (800 miles) and to the fact that there are only three mail deliveries per week from Port Arthur to the powerhouse. 3. The Commission has three short-wave radio stations in operation.

Mr. Baxter asked the following Question (No. 98):—

1. What was the total cost to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of its Forestry Division during the last fiscal year. 2. How many are engaged in this division, in the Head Office of the Commission.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. The total cost to the Commission of its Forestry Division for the past fiscal year was \$86,384.07, which incidently includes the cost of certain reforestation work for the Queenston Canal. The total number of trees pruned was 46,584, or an average cost per tree of \$1.85. The trees were spread over approximately 1,070 miles of line. The approximate miles of line under the Commission's charge, most of which require tree trimming and right-of-way work, are as follows:

Steel Tower.....	1,934 miles
Wood Pole.....	3,788 "
Rural (wood pole).....	8,918 "
Telephone.....	1,131 "
Total.....	15,771 "

2. One man, a clerk, engaged in this Division in the Head Office of the Commission. The headquarters of the Superintendent of the Division is also at the Head Office but most of his time is spent in the field. It might be pointed out that the tree-trimming work of the Forestry Division does not represent new work, since it was formerly done by the line maintenance gangs. The Forestry Division was organized to do the work in a manner more in keeping with the public demand for the preservation of the beauty of the trees.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 108), An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

Bill (No. 53), An Act to amend The Marriage Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 4), An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Bill (No. 12), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 15), An Act respecting the Town of Sandwich.

Bill (No. 17), An Act respecting the Canadian Transit Company.

Bill (No. 48), An Act respecting the Town of Kenora and The Keewatin Power Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 106), An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Commissioner of The Ontario Provincial Police for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 45.*)

The House then adjourned at 4.10 p.m.

TUESDAY, MARCH 28TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 117), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Service Works on Highways Act." *Mr. Jamieson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 118), intituled "An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act." *Mr. Henry* (York East).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 119), intituled "An Act to amend the Act of Incorporation of the Town of Kapuskasing, 11 George V, 1921, Chapter 36." *Mr. Finlayson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time, Mr. Elliott (Bruce North) moved, seconded by Mr. Hipel,

That all the words of the Motion after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

"This House condemns the Government for its failure to balance the Budget."

And a debate arising, after some time it was on the motion of Mr. Acres,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until Wednesday next.

The House then adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 120), intituled "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 121), intituled "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act." *Mr. Nixon*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 122), intituled "An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act." *Mr. Robb*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 123), intituled "An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act." *Mr. Robb*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 124), intituled "The School Law Amendment Act, 1933." *Mr. Henry* (York East).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 125), intituled "An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly." *Mr. Henry* (York East).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were read the third time and were passed:—

Bill (No. 56), An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act.

Bill (No. 59), An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Bill (No. 57), An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Bill (No. 81), An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Bill (No. 52), An Act respecting The Ontario Institute of Radio Therapy.

Bill (No. 94), An Act to amend The Old Age Pensions Act.

Bill (No. 100), The Nursery Stock Act.

Bill (No. 107), An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act.

Bill (No. 11), An Act respecting the Town of Niagara.

Bill (No. 41), An Act respecting the Toronto East General Hospital and Toronto Orthopedic Hospital.

Bill (No. 46), An Act respecting the Township of Crowland.

Bill (No. 24), An Act respecting the Township of East York.

Bill (No. 44), An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall.

Bill (No. 105), An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act.

Bill (No. 110), The Relief Land Settlement Act.

Bill (No. 4), An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Bill (No. 12), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 15), An Act respecting the Town of Sandwich.

Bill (No. 17), An Act respecting the Canadian Transit Company.

Bill (No. 48), An Act respecting the Town of Kenora and The Keewatin Power Company, Limited.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 98), An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 115), An Act to amend The Stenographic Reporters' Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 114), An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 101), An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act, having been read,

Mr. Nixon moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on the following Division:—

YEAS

Baxter	Medd	Robertson
Blakelock	Munro	Ross
Bragg	Murray	Simpson
Elliott	McQuibban	Slack
(Bruce, North)	Newman	Taylor—18.
Hipel	Nixon	
Mackay	Oliver	

NAYS

Acres	Jamieson	Price
Baird	Jutten	(Parkdale)
Bell	Kennedy	Raven
Berry	(Temiskaming)	Reid
Black	Kennedy	Richardson
Blanchard	(Peel)	Robb
Burt	Kenning	St. Denis
Calder	Lancaster	Sanderson
Case	Laughton	Scholfield
Challies	Lyons	Seguin
Clark	Macaulay	Shaver
Colliver	Mahony	Shields
Cooke	Martin	Singer
Coté	(Hamilton)	Skinner
Craig	Martin	Smith
Davis	(Brantford)	(Essex, South)
Ellis	Monteith	Smith
Finlayson	Moore	(Greenwood)
Fraleigh	Morrison	Spence
Freele	Murphy	Staples
Graham	(St. Patrick)	Stedman
Graves	Murphy	Strickland
Harcourt	(Beaches)	Vaughan
Harrison	McArthur	Waters
Heighington	McBrien	Willson
Henry	McCrea	(Niagara Falls)
(York, East)	McLean	Wilson
Hill	McMillen	(Windsor, East)
Hogarth	McNaughton	Wilson
Honeywell	Nesbitt	(Lincoln)
Ireland	Poisson	Wright—80.

And so it was declared in the Negative.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 53), An Act to amend The Marriage Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 49), The Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Hill reported, That the Committee had directed him to report progress, and to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time, it was on the motion of Mr. Blakelock,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

THURSDAY, MARCH 30TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Price, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Seventh Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 40), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 47), An Act respecting the Town of Walkerville.

Your Committee would recommend that Rule 60 of Your Honourable House be suspended in this, that the time for receiving Reports of Committees on Private Bills be further extended until and inclusive of Thursday, the 6th day of April next.

Ordered, That Rule 60 of Your Honourable House be suspended in this, that the time for receiving Reports of Committees on Private Bills be further extended until and inclusive of Thursday, the 6th day of April next.

Mr. Wright, from the Standing Committee on Printing, presented their Second and final Report, which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee recommend that the following be purchased for the Members of the Legislature:—

One hundred and twelve copies each of The Canadian Parliamentary Guide, The Canadian Annual Review, Pioneers of Upper Canada, and also 112 copies of a Geographical Globe of the World.

Your Committee recommends that Departmental Reports be ordered printed in the following quantities:—

Estimates, Supplementary.....	1,600
Estimates, Main.....	1,600
Mines.....	3,400
Inspector of Legal Offices.....	1,000
Insurance.....	1,700
Loan Corporations.....	1,050
Public Works.....	700
Game and Fisheries.....	2,600
Labour.....	1,600
University of Toronto.....	600
Births, Marriages and Deaths.....	1,500
Health.....	1,600
Provincial Police.....	750
Public Hospitals, Hospital for Incurables and Sanitoria for Consumptives.....	1,200
Prisons and Reformatories.....	1,000
Public Welfare.....	2,600
Liquor Control Board.....	2,600
Agriculture.....	2,100
Agriculture (Statistics).....	6,600
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway.....	800
Elections.....	1,100
Hydro-Electric Commission.....	4,100

Provincial Auditor.....	650
Workmen's Compensation Board.....	1,600
Minimum Wage Board.....	1,100
Ontario Veterinary College.....	2,100
Report, The Northern Development Act.....	900

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 126), intituled "An Act to amend The Bulk Sales Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 127), intituled "An Act to amend The Division Courts Act." *Mr. Smith* (Essex South).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 125), An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly.

Referred to a Select Committee to be appointed.

On motion by *Mr. Henry* (York East), seconded by *Mr. McCrea*,

Ordered, That a Select Committee of seventeen Members be appointed to consider and fill in the schedule in Bill (No. 125), "An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly" with all convenient speed, such Committee to be composed as follows:—

Honourable Mr. Henry, Messrs. Baxter, Coté, Davis, Finlayson, Hogarth, Hutchinson, Ireland, Macaulay, Mahony, McMillen, McQuibban, Murphy (Beaches), *Newman, Nixon, Robertson and Taylor*.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Motion that *Mr. Speaker* do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And the House having continued to sit until Twelve of the Clock midnight,

Friday, March 31st, 1933,

The Debate continued.

And after some time, it was on the motion of Mr. Sinclair,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Annual Report of The Ontario Athletic Commission for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers, No. 16.*)

The House then adjourned at 1.15 a.m.

FRIDAY, MARCH 31st, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 128), intituled "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act." *Mr. McCrea.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 129), intituled "An Act respecting Insurance." *Mr. Price.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. Nixon asked the following Question (No. 2):—

1. Has Mr. W. N. Tilley, K.C., or any member of the firm of Tilley, Johnson, Thomson and Parmenter, Barristers, or the firm itself been retained by the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission in any capacity since January 1st, 1926. If so, what were the occasions and the total amounts of retainers and fees paid by the Commission in each instance. 2. Has any other outside branch of the public service other than Hydro-Electric Power Commission

retained Mr. Tilley since above date. If so, what were the occasions and amounts in each case.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. Yes. Messrs. Tilley, Johnston, Thomson and Parmenter are Solicitors for the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission, and have been since 1902. The total amount of retainers and fees paid by the Commission since January 1st, 1926:—

Year 1926	Retainer.....	\$4,800.00
" 1926	Fee <i>re</i> litigation Abrahams and Commission.....	140.00
" 1927	Retainer.....	4,800.00
" 1927	Special services before Senate Railway Committee <i>re</i> Quebec and Occidental Railway Bill.....	525 00
" 1928	Retainer.....	4,800.00
" 1928	Special services <i>re</i> Temiskaming and Northern Ontario debenture issue.....	1,000.00
" 1929	Retainer.....	4,800.00
" 1930	Retainer.....	4,800 00
" 1931	Retainer.....	4,800.00
" 1932	Retainer.....	4,800.00

These payments include all expenses and disbursements.

The Nipissing Central Railway Company is owned and operated by the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Commission, and the total amounts of retainers and fees paid in this connection since January 1st, 1926, is as follows:—

1926:	Charge from January 4th, 1926, to September 7th, 1926, including consultations and advising prior to the application from the Attorney-General of Quebec to the Privy Council for special leave to appeal from the judgement of the Supreme Court of Canada, in favour of the Nipissing Central Railway Company extending its line of railway from the Ontario boundary to Rouyn in the Province of Quebec. Instructing London, England, Agents and Counsel <i>re</i> application for special leave to postpone Hearing of the Appeals. Opposing Appeal to Privy Council referred to (including allowance for Mr. W. N. Tilley's expenses to England), together with all necessary attendances, correspondence and other services in connection with this matter. Including fees and disbursements paid London, England, Agents and Counsel. Including fees and disbursements paid Ottawa, Ontario Agents, cables and other incidental disbursements.....	\$13,983.65
	Less taxed costs in Privy Council paid by Province of Quebec	2,403.78
		<hr/> \$11,579.87

1927: Charges for professional services, expenses and disbursements covering attendance of Mr. W. N. Tilley, K.C., and Mr. R. H. Parmenter, K.C., at Ottawa and interviews with the Department of Railways and Canal officials, the Deputy Minister of

Justice, *et al*, in connection with application of the Nipissing Central Railway for Order-in-Council authorizing extension of its railway into Rouyn in the Province of Quebec. Reviewing Order-in-Council after it had been passed, giving opinions as to the Railway's rights to proceed with construction, etc.

Total fee for period September, 1926, to May 31st, 1927..... 1,000.00

Total..... \$12,579.87

2. No.

Mr. Slack asked the following Question (No. 11):—

1. How many employees are on the permanent staff of the Workmen's Compensation Board. 2. How many temporary or occasional employees were employed last year. 3. What was the total wage bill of the Board. 4. (a) What sum was applied from funds of the Board as a contribution to group insurance costs. (b) What sum did employees contribute to group insurance costs. How many contributed. (c) How much insurance did this buy. (d) What was the cost per \$1,000 to an individual employee. 5. Has any action been taken to put into effect the provisions for superannuation which this House passed last year.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. 117 in 1932. 2. 15 to 23. 3. \$229,259.36 exclusive of Commissioners' salaries. 4. (a) From the beginning, September 13th, 1927, to the end of 1932, \$4,032.52. (b) From the beginning, September 13th, 1927, to the end of 1932, \$7,130.54. Each permanent and temporary employee after three months' service, with the exception of a rehabilitation clinic, total number 142, but a number only part of the year. (c) \$218,800. (d) 50 cents per month. 5. No.

Mr. Simpson asked the following Question (No. 68):—

What has been the cost to date of the Game and Fish Committee appointed two years ago under the Chairmanship of the Honourable Mr. Black.

The Honourable the Provincial Secretary replied as follows:—

The Fish and Game Committee consists of nine members and held sixty meetings over a period of two years.

Total allowances to members amounted to.....	\$7,785.00
Reporter.....	1,712.50
Travelling expenses.....	1,370.71
Miscellaneous expenses.....	878.45

\$11,746.66

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 93):—

What amount was spent by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in (1) Wages and (2) Salaries, in (a) Operation, (b) Maintenance and (c) Administration, during the last fiscal year.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

As it is impossible to separate wages and salaries with any degree of accuracy (1) is answered by (2):—

(2) Wages and Salaries:	(a) Operation.....	\$3,009,796.54
“ “ “	(b) Maintenance.....	1,139,924.73
“ “ “	(c) Administration.....	370,114.56

Under the heading of “Administration” is distributed the wages and salaries of officers and assistants of the Accounting, Filing, Mailing and Stenographic Departments.

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 99):—

1. What was the total cost of the Legal Department of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission for salaries and services of all connected with said department during the last fiscal year. 2. How many lawyers are employed in said department.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. \$42,840.36. 2. Six, including the General Solicitor.

Mr. Ross asked the following Question (No. 105):—

1. On what date, and under what authority, did the Workmen's Compensation Board first use money from the Accident Fund to pay a portion of the cost of group insurance of members of the Board and employees. 2. What is the total amount that has been used for this purpose to date. 3. How much insurance is carried by each member of the Board under this scheme. Is this accident insurance or life insurance. 4. Does the Government make any contribution towards the costs of administration of the Board. If so, how much.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. September 13th, 1927. General powers as to administration. 2. \$4,207.37. 3. \$3,000 Life and Total Disability Insurance. Since the 1st of January, 1931, it has been paid by the members of the Board. 4. No.

Mr. Hutchinson asked the following Question (No. 112):—

1. Has a lease for power purposes ever been given on Pelican Falls, near Sioux Lookout. 2. If so, when and to whom. 3. For what consideration.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. No. 2. Answered by No. 1. 3. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. Tweed asked the following Question (No. 134):—

1. What has been the total amount borrowed by the Province for the financing of Provincial Highways for the years 1924 to 1932, both inclusive.
2. What provision by way of sinking fund, or otherwise, has been made to provide for the repayment of the amount so borrowed.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. \$79,275,424.91. 2. The retirement of the amounts borrowed for financing Provincial Highways is included in the general Debt Retirement Plan of the Province at present suspended due to economic conditions.

On motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. McQuibban,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing: 1. (a) How many automobiles, trucks and motorcycles were owned by the Ontario Government in each of the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive. (b) What was the total cost of maintenance and operation in each of the above years. 2. (a) How many automobiles, trucks and motorcycles were given mileage and other allowances by the Ontario Government during the above years. (b) What was the cost during these years.

On motion of Mr. Ross, seconded by Mr. Nixon,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing: 1. What is the total amount in arrears to the Agricultural Development Board. 2. How many individual farmers owe this amount. 3. How many have been in arrears for two years, what amount. 4. How many have been in arrears for more than two years. What amount.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee to consider a certain proposed Resolution respecting the replacement of Section 9 of The Succession Duty Act by a new Section 9, setting forth the manner in which the Succession Duty Tax shall be assessed against estates coming within the provisions of the Act and that an additional duty by way of surtax of ten per centum on all duties imposed under The Succession Duty Act be levied and added to and collected with such duties.

Mr. Henry (York East) acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee)

Resolved, "That Section 9 of The Succession Duty Act be replaced by a new Section 9, setting forth the manner in which the Succession Duty Tax shall be assessed against estates coming within the provisions of the Act, and

"That an additional duty by way of surtax of ten per centum on all duties imposed under The Succession Duty Act be levied and added to and collected with such duties."

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, that the Committee had come to a certain Resolution.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Resolved, "That Section 9 of The Succession Duty Act be replaced by a new Section 9, setting forth the manner in which the Succession Duty Tax shall be assessed against estates coming within the provisions of the Act, and

"That an additional duty by way of surtax of ten per centum on all duties imposed under The Succession Duty Act be levied and added to and collected with such duties."

The Resolution, having been read the second time, was agreed to, and referred to the House on Bill (No. 112).

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 40), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 47), An Act respecting the Town of Walkerville.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 120), An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 126), An Act to amend The Bulk Sales Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 112), An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 89), An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 49), The Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 115), An Act to amend The Stenographic Reporters' Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 114), An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 102), The Northern Ontario Appropriation Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time on Monday next.

The House then adjourned at 5.05 p.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 3RD, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That the name of Mr. Lyons be added to the Select Committee appointed to consider Bill (No. 125), An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Newman asked the following Question (No. 116):—

1. What amount of money has been spent on the Haliburton-Eagle Lake Road. 2. What portion thereof was contributed by Dysart Township. 3. What portion thereof was paid by the Federal Government.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. During the winter of 1931-1932 the total expenditure authorized was \$40,000.00, of which the Federal Government contributed 37½ per cent., the Province 37½ per cent., and the Municipality of the Township of Dysart 25 per cent., and the money was all expended by the Municipal Council. During the winter of 1932-1933 the authorized expenditure was \$75,000.00, of which \$67,275.47 has been paid to date; the funds to be provided by a grant of \$25,000.00 from the Relief Funds of the Federal Government; \$25,000.00 from the Relief Funds of the Province; and the remaining \$25,000.00 by the Canada Land and Immigration Company. This Company, which was made responsible for carrying on the work, received tenders and let a contract to a responsible firm of contractors to do the work. 2. Answered by No. 1. 3. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. Newman asked the following Question (No. 119):—

1. What amount has been spent as relief measures on King's Highways in Ontario.
2. What amount has been spent on the Ferguson Highway.
3. What amount has been spent on the Trans-Canada Highway.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. On No. 7 Highway from Actinolite to Bathurst the Department of Highways has spent the sum of \$1,978,263.57, of which \$400,000.00 was paid by the Federal Government under the Unemployment Relief Act, and \$600,000.00 from the Province of Ontario Unemployment Relief Act. 2. On the Ferguson Highway, the Department of Northern Development has spent the sum of \$298,715.81 as Relief Work, of which 40 per cent. is being borne by the Federal Government and 60 per cent. by the Province. 3. On the Trans-Canada Highway, the Department of Northern Development has spent the sum of \$6,333,726.47 as Relief Work, of which 50 per cent. is being borne by the Federal Government, and 50 per cent. by the Province, and a further sum of \$1,611,461.58, of which the Federal Government contributes 50 per cent., less overhead and engineering charges, and the Province contributes 50 per cent., plus overhead and engineering charges.

Mr. Newman asked the following Question (No. 120):—

1. What amount of money has been spent on the Coboconk-Dorset Road.
2. What portion of this was contributed by the Federal Government.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. \$372,478.16 was spent on the Coboconk-Dorset Road as a relief measure, of which the Federal Government contributed 40 per cent., and the Province 60 per cent., and \$33,064.86 of which the Federal Government contributes 50 per cent., less overhead and engineering services, and the Province contributes 50 per cent., plus overhead and engineering charges. The Public Works report a bridge expenditure during 1931-32 and 1932-33 of \$18,409.68 on this road. 2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. Ross asked the following Question (No. 121):—

1. Is the Penny Bank of Ontario in any way under the control or inspection of the Provincial Government.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. No. The Statute permits school boards to establish and maintain the Penny Banks to encourage thrift.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 126):—

1. How many Civil Servants are in the employ of the Government over the age of sixty-five years. 2. How many Civil Servants are in the employ of the Government who are receiving pensions under The War Pension Act.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. Civil Servants in the employ of the Government over sixty-five years of age, 412. 2. The Government has no record on which a reply to this question can be based.

Mr. Medd asked the following Question (No. 128):—

1. What was the quantity of cheese exported by the Ontario Marketing Board (a) 1931, (b) 1932. 2. What were the total receipts for the cheese exported in (a) 1931, (b), 1932. 3. What was the cost per pound of marketing the cheese exported by the Ontario Marketing Board during (a) 1931, (b) 1932.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture replied as follows:—

1. (a) 46,853 lbs. (b) None. 2. (a) \$6,017.82. (b) Answered in No. 1 (b). 3. (a) 2.46c. per pound. (b) Answered in No. 1 (b).

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 132):—

1. Has any complaint regarding irregularities in the Talbotville Division been made to the Department of Highways. 2. If so, has any money been paid back to the Department of Highways. 3. Was an investigation made in this connecton.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. No. (No overpayment was made, consequently no money had to be paid back.) 3. Yes.

Mr. Slack asked the following Question (No. 136):—

1. In how many counties and provisional judicial districts have Cemetery Commissions been set up under The Cemetery Act, 1931. 2. In how many counties has no action been taken under this Act. 3. Has the Government or Department of Health taken any action to compel compliance with the Act in cases where no local action has been taken. 4. In how many instances have counties taken action and the Government has not made the appointment of a chairman. 5. What are the names of the chairmen appointed by the Government and the county in each case. 6. What rate of fees and expenses are allowable under the regulations.

The Honourable the Minister of Health replied as follows:—

1. 19. 2. 18. 3. No. 4. 5.

5.—

County	Chairman	Address
Bruce.....	Adam W. Little....	Teeswater.
Carleton.....	Arthur B. Davis....	Dunrobin.
Dufferin.....	H. S. Rutledge....	Orangeville.
Durham and Northumberland....	A. C. Eagleson....	Cold Springs.
Frontenac.....	Mathew Shannon....	R.R. No. 2, Kingston.
Haldimand.....	O. E. Reichheld....	Fisherville.
Halton.....	Samuel Kirk.....	Georgetown.
Kent.....	M. J. Wilson.....	Chatham.
Lambton.....	Jas. E. Wallis.....	Alvinston.
Lanark.....	Judge J. H. Scott....	Perth.
Lennox and Addington.....	S. D. Wagar.....	Enterprise.
Norfolk.....	David Gilbertson....	Simcoe.
Ontario.....	Judge Ruddy.....	Whitby.
Oxford.....	Jas. Pullin.....	Woodstock.
Perth.....	Hugh Richmond....	Listowell.
Peterborough.....	Matthew Elliott....	R.R. No. 2, Norwood.
Prince Edward.....	S. H. Simpson....	Picton.
Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry..	Mahlon Bailey....	Winchester.
Waterloo.....	John Colombo....	46 Shanley St., Kitchener.
Wellington.....	John L. Carter....	Fergus.

6. County Councils are given the authority to set per diem rates not to exceed, however, \$8.00 per diem. Ordinary and reasonable travelling expenses are allowed.

On motion of Mr. Medd, seconded by Mr. Nixon,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing: 1. What is the total sum of money paid to the firm of Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle & Nash, Accountants, or to any member or employee of the firm during each of the last three fiscal years by (a) the Government; (b) Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario; (c) any other outside public service department of the Government.

On motion of Mr. Medd, seconded by Mr. Nixon,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing: 1. To whom has the Ontario Liquor Control Board allotted (a) Brewers' Warehouse Licenses in Toronto, Ottawa, London, Windsor, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Niagara Falls, Brantford, Chatham, St. Thomas, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, North Bay, Fort William, Port Arthur, Walkerville, Oshawa, Brockville and East Windsor. (b) Who owns each warehouse. 2. Do the breweries pay fees to the licensees in order (a) to have their beer sold through the warehouses. (b) If so, how much are the fees paid. (c) Who receives these fees, the Ontario Liquor

Control Board, or the licensee. 3. How much does each licensee receive per case on all beer sold through his warehouse, and to whom does this money go. 4. Do the Brewers pay the cost or percentage of cost of operating these warehouses. 5. (a) Who appoints the staffs of these warehouses. (b) Who sets their rate of pay, and who pays them. (c) What is the average wage paid in each of the warehouses named in No. 1.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee to consider a certain proposed Resolution respecting certain proposed changes in the Corporations Tax Act.

Mr. Henry (York East) acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee)

Resolved 1, That Section 12 of The Corporations Tax Act, as enacted by Section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act, 1932, be repealed and that the following tax on the transfer of securities be imposed in lieu of the tax imposed by said Section:—

“Upon every change of ownership consequent upon the sale, transfer or assignment of any share of stock of any association, company or corporation, or of any bond, debenture or share of debenture stock made or carried into effect in Ontario, or of any participating interest in the operations or profits of an association, company or corporation, represented by certificates or other instruments of title capable of being sold, transferred or assigned, including mineral deeds, oil royalties, and fixed investment trust shares issued by a trustee and representing an equitable ownership in deposited securities, and upon every order given in Ontario for the sale, transfer or assignment of any such securities when the order is to be executed outside of Ontario, there shall be imposed, levied and collected a tax as follows:—

(a) Three cents for every One Hundred Dollars or fraction thereof, of the par value of a bond, debenture or debenture stock;

(b) Five cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over One Hundred and Fifty Dollars per share;

(c) Four cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over Seventy-five Dollars per share but not more than One Hundred and Fifty Dollars per share;

(d) Three cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over Fifty Dollars per share but not more than Seventy-five Dollars per share;

(e) Two cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over Twenty-five Dollars per share but not more than Fifty Dollars per share;

(f) One cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over Five Dollars per share but not more than Twenty-five Dollars per share;

(g) One-quarter of one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price of One Dollar to Five Dollars per share, but not more than Five Dollars per share;

(h) One-tenth of one per cent. of the value of every share of stock sold or transferred at a price less than One Dollar per share.

Resolved 2, That the following transactions be not subject to the said tax:—

(a) The sale, transfer or assignment of any bond, debenture or share of debenture stock of the Dominion of Canada or of any Province of Canada;

(b) The assignment of the allotment of the shares of any association, company or corporation or of the right to receive when issued the unallotted shares of any association, company or corporation;

(c) The allotment by any association, company or corporation of its shares in order to effect an issue thereof and the first issue of a bond, debenture or share of debenture stock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, that the Committee had come to a certain Resolution.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Resolved 1, That Section 12 of The Corporations Tax Act, as enacted by Section 4 of The Corporations Tax Act, 1932, be repealed and that the following tax on the transfer of securities be imposed in lieu of the tax imposed by said Section:—

“Upon every change of ownership consequent upon the sale, transfer or assignment of any share of stock of any association, company or corporation, or of any bond, debenture or share of debenture stock made or carried into effect in Ontario, or of any participating interest in the operations or profits of an association, company or corporation, represented by certificates or other instruments of title capable of being sold, transferred or assigned, including mineral deeds, oil royalties, and fixed investment trust shares issued by a trustee and representing an equitable ownership in deposited securities, and upon every order given in Ontario for the sale, transfer or assignment of any such securities when the order is to be executed outside of Ontario, there shall be imposed, levied and collected a tax as follows:—

(a) Three cents for every One Hundred Dollars or fraction thereof, of the par value of a bond, debenture or debenture stock;

(b) Five cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over One Hundred and Fifty Dollars per share;

(c) Four cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over Seventy-five Dollars per share but not more than One Hundred and Fifty Dollars per share;

(d) Three cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over Fifty Dollars per share but not more than Seventy-five Dollars per share;

(e) Two cents for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over Twenty-five Dollars per share but not more than Fifty Dollars per share;

(f) One cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price over Five Dollars per share but not more than Twenty-five Dollars per share;

(g) One-quarter of one cent for every share of stock sold or transferred at a price of One Dollar to Five Dollars per share, but not more than Five Dollars per share;

(h) One-tenth of one per cent. of the value of every share of stock sold or transferred at a price less than One Dollar per share.

Resolved 2, That the following transactions be not subject to the said tax:—

(a) The sale, transfer or assignment of any bond, debenture or share of debenture stock of the Dominion of Canada or of any Province of Canada;

(b) The assignment of the allotment of the shares of any association, company or corporation or of the right to receive when issued the unallotted shares of any association, company or corporation;

(c) The allotment by any association, company or corporation of its shares in order to effect an issue thereof and the first issue of a bond, debenture or share of debenture stock.

The Resolution, having been read the second time, was agreed to, and referred to the House on Bill (No. 118).

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 113), An Act to amend The Cemetery Act, 1931.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 116), An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 127), An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

Bill (No. 118), An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 122), An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 123), An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 40), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 47), An Act respecting the Town of Walkerville.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 120), An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 126), An Act to amend The Bulk Sales Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 112), An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 60), An Act respecting Collection Agencies, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 4.18 p.m.

TUESDAY, APRIL 4TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 130), intituled "An Act to amend The Woodmen's Lien for Wages Act." *Mr. Hutchinson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 131), intituled "An Act respecting Equities of Redemption in Residence Properties." *Mr. Oliver.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply, having been read,

The Debate was resumed,

And after some time,

The Amendment, that:—

"This House condemns the Government for its failure to balance the Budget,"

Having been put was lost on the following Division:—

YEAS

Baxter
Blakelock
Bragg
Elliott
(Bruce, North)
Hipel
Mackay

Medd
Murray
McQuibban
Newman
Nixon
Oliver
Robertson

Ross
Sangster
Simpson
Sinclair
Slack
Taylor
Tweed—20.

NAYS

Acres
Baird
Bell
Berry
Black
Blanchard
Burt
Calder
Case
Challies
Colliver
Cooke
Coté
Craig
Davis
Elliott
(Rainy River)

Finlayson
Freele
Graves
Hambly
Harcourt
Harrison
Heighington
Henry
(York, East)
Henry
(Kent, East)

Hill
Honeywell

Ireland
Jamieson
Jutten
Kennedy
(Temiskaming)
Kennedy
(Peel)
Kenning
Lancaster
Laughton
Lyons
Macaulay
Martin
(Hamilton)
Martin
(Brantford)

Monteith
Moore
Morrison
Murphy
(St. Patrick)
Murphy
(Beaches)
McArthur
McBrien
McCrea
McLean
McMillen
McNaughton
Poisson

Price
(Parkdale)
Price
(York West)
Raven
Reid
Richardson
Robb
St. Denis
Sanderson
Scholfield
Seguin
Shaver
Shields
Singer
Skinner
Smith
(Essex, South)
Smith
(Greenwood)
Spence
Staples
Stedman
Strickland
Willson
(Niagara Falls)
Wilson
(Windsor, East)
Wilson
(Lincoln)
Wright—75.

PAIRS

Munro Vaughan

The main Motion having then been put was carried on the following Division:—

YEAS

Acres	Ireland	Price
Baird	Jamieson	(Parkdale)
Bell	Jutten	Price
Berry	Kennedy	(York, West)
Black	(Temiskaming)	Raven
Blanchard	Kennedy	Reid
Burt	(Peel)	Richardson
Calder	Kenning	Robb
Case	Lancaster	St. Denis
Challies	Laughton	Sanderson
Colliver	Lyons	Scholfield
Cooke	Macaulay	Seguin
Coté	Martin	Shaver
Craig	(Hamilton)	Shields
Davis	Martin	Singer
Elliott	(Brantford)	Skinner
(Rainy River)	Monteith	Smith
Finlayson	Moore	(Essex, South)
Freele	Morrison	Smith
Graves	Murphy	(Greenwood)
Hambly	(St. Patrick)	Spence
Harcourt	Murphy	Staples
Harrison	(Beaches)	Stedman
Heighington	McArthur	Strickland
Henry	McBrien	Willson
(York, East)	McCrea	(Niagara Falls)
Henry	McLean	Wilson
(Kent, East)	McMillen	(Windsor, East)
Hill	McNaughton	Wilson
Honeywell	Poisson	(Lincoln)
		Wright—75.

NAYS

Baxter	Medd	Ross
Blakelock	Murray	Sangster
Bragg	McQuibban	Simpson
Elliott	Newman	Sinclair
(Bruce, North)	Nixon	Slack
Hipel	Oliver	Taylor
Mackay	Robertson	Tweed—20.

And the House, according to Order, resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1933, the following sum:

1. To defray the expenses of the Lieutenant Governor. \$1,900 00

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had come to a Resolution; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received Tomorrow.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again Tomorrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor:

Annual Report of the Ontario Municipal Board for year ending December 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 24.*)

Also, Annual Report of the Department of Health, Ontario, 1932. (*Sessional Paper No. 14.*)

The House then adjourned at 7.00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5TH 1933

PRAYER.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

On motion of Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Williams (Noyahs Valley),

Ordered, That the provisions of Item No. 56 of the Budget be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Mr. McLean from the Standing Committee on Laws, Bills, presented their First Report, which was read as follows and adopted.

The Standing Committee on Laws, Bills, to which was referred Bill (No. 47), An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, 1922, do hereby report.

The Public Health Act; Bill (No. 68), An Act to amend The Jurors' Act, and Bill (No. 111), An Act to extend the Time for Commencement of Actions for Simple Contract Debts, recommends that the Bills be not further proceeded with.

Your Committee begs to report Bill (No. 99), An Act to amend The Innkeepers' Act, as amended.

Your Committee has carefully studied the provisions of Bill (No. 68), An Act to amend The Jurors' Act, and recommends that a sub-committee of this Committee consisting of Messrs. Sinclair, Côté and Smith (Essex South) be authorized to study this Act during recess and be prepared to submit the result of their deliberations at the next Session of this House, the said sub-committee to act without payment of fees during the recess.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 132), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." *Mr. Vaughan.*

Ordered. That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 133), intituled "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act." *Mr. Cooke.*

Ordered. That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 134), intituled "An Act to amend The Insurance Act." *Mr. Price (Parkdale).*

Ordered. That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 135), intituled "An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowance Act." *Mr. Martin (Brantford).*

Ordered. That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 136), intituled "An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act." *Mr. McCrea.*

Ordered. That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 137), intituled "An Act respecting the Acquisition of the Properties of the Ontario Power Service Corporation." *Mr. Henry (York East).*

Ordered. That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

On motion of Mr. Hipel, seconded by Mr. Sinclair,

Ordered. That there be laid before this House a Return showing: 1. What

was the cost of the Ontario Government Garage in the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive. 2. How many new trucks, motorcycles and automobiles were purchased during the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive. 3. What was the cost of each automobile purchased during the years 1929-1932, inclusive.

Mr. Hutchinson asked the following Question (No. 46):—

1. Did Police Magistrate Emerson Coatsworth, K.C., tender to the Attorney-General or to the Government his resignation as a Police Commissioner, or as Senior Police Magistrate, at any time during 1932. 2. If so, what disposition was made of the same and why.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. Yes. As a member of the Police Commission. 2. He was to carry on temporarily.

Mr. Simpson asked the following Question (No. 70):—

1. What position, if any, does Edward Chauvin of Noelville hold in the services of the Government of Ontario. 2. What salary has he been receiving. 3. How much did he earn in the year ending 1930-31, and the year ending October, 1931-32. 4. Was his car furnished by the Provincial Government. 5. If so, how much did it cost him in gas and repairs.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. None. 2. He held position of foreman at rates varying, according to responsibility, from \$2.40 to \$4.50 daily. 3. 1930-31, \$513.90; 1931-32, \$914.00. 4. No. 5. Have no information.

Mr. Taylor asked the following Question (No. 71):—

1. Is Hydro Commissioner Right Honourable Arthur Meighen Chairman or President of the Canadian General Investments Limited or has he been within the last year. 2. Did this Company hold any of the bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited prior to, at the time, or subsequent to, negotiations for the taking over by the Government and Hydro-Electric Power Commission of the partially completed development on the Abitibi. If so, what was the amount of the bonds so held. 3. Did this Company or any of its predecessors, First, Second, Third, or Fourth General Investment Trust Limited hold bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited while the Hydro had a contract to take power from the Power Service Corporation Limited. If so, what was the amount of bonds so held.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

Answers to Questions 1, 2 and 3:—

The Government is informed that Right Honourable Arthur Meighen is Chairman of the Board of Canadian General Investments, Limited.

The Government is informed that certain of the bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, Limited, were purchased by Canadian General Investments, Limited, but, apart from the list of bonds exchanged for debentures of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, the Government is not aware of the amount of bonds held by Canadian General Investments, Limited, or its predecessors.

Mr. Meighen has informed the Government that the Investment Companies referred to in the questions are companies owned by some four thousand shareholders throughout the Dominion, Great Britain and the United States, and that the annual reports of these companies covering their operations since 1929 have shown them, or some of them, as holders of Ontario Power Service bonds along with several hundred other securities, and that Mr. Meighen is and has been associated with the company, which has a management contract with these Investment Companies, and has been throughout this period Chairman of the Boards of the Investment Companies.

Mr. Meighen also informs the Government that the directors of the Investment Companies have never deemed it in the interests of their shareholders to give to the public details of purchases and sales of their various holdings, under which circumstances obviously neither Mr. Meighen nor the Management Company has the right to diverge from the policy of the directors in this regard. Mr. Meighen maintains that these companies are manifestly entitled to treatment on the same basis as any others and to the application of the very same principles governing disclosure of the details of other businesses.

Mr. Meighen had no part in any negotiations for the acquirement of the property or the bonds of Ontario Power Service Corporation, Limited, and he informs the Government that from the day of his appointment until now there has never been a time when any information bearing on the value of such bonds was known to him or was available to be known to him not equally available to the general public. The acquisition of the bonds and property of Ontario Power Service Corporation was negotiated and undertaken for the benefit of the Province and not as an enterprise of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission which merely acted as agent for and at the request of the Government.

Mr. Medd asked the following Question (No. 111):—

1. What was the total sale during the last fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932, by the Liquor Commission of (a) Spirituous Liquor, (b) Wine, (c) Beer.
2. What was the total sale of wine by wineries during the last fiscal year.
- (b) What was the total quantity of wine sold from the wineries during the last fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932.
3. What was the total sale of beer through brewery warehouses and breweries during the last fiscal year.
4. How much 4.4 beer was sold in Ontario last year.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. (a) Spirituous Liquors, \$18,303,988.39. (b) Wines, \$2,927,973.20. (c) Beers, \$1,557,772.86. 2. (a) Direct wine sales totalled \$1,090,018.12. (b) Quantity of wine sold by wineries direct to permit holders 568,109 gallons. 3. Sales of beer direct to permit holders from breweries and brewery warehouses, \$13,369,827.40. 4. Sale from breweries of Light Beer (4.4.) totalled \$1,039,368.04.
-

Mr. Nixon asked the following Question (No. 114):—

1. Did the Premier, or any Member of the Government, the Chairman of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, or either of the Commissioners, hold or control any of the bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation prior to, at the time, or subsequent to, the making of the public offer by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, at the request of the Government, to the holders of bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation to exchange such bonds for debentures of the Commission guaranteed by the Province of Ontario. 2. If so, what was the amount of the bonds in each instance so held or controlled, who by, and when purchased.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

The Premier held \$25,000.00 of the bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, Limited, purchased in August, 1930.

The Right Honourable Arthur Meighen held \$3,000.00 of the bonds which were purchased in the open market on November 30th, 1931.

The Government is informed that on the 3rd of January these latter bonds, or the debentures of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission for which they were exchanged were sold, and that as the bonds were pledged with American collateral as security for a loan the loss on exchange was such as to leave the result of the transaction to Mr. Meighen as merely return of principal, plus a fair interest. Mr. Meighen never at any time owned directly or indirectly any further interest of any kind in the company and took no part whatever in the negotiations between the Government and the bondholders.

No other Member of the Government, or any of the other Commissioners, held or controlled any of the bonds.

Mr. Nixon asked the following Question (No. 115):—

1. Has the Montreal Trust Company been given any authority, or appointed to do any work in connection with the public offer made by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, at the request of the Government, to holders of bonds of Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited, to exchange such bonds

for debentures of the Commission guaranteed by the Province of Ontario. If so, what was the nature of the work or authority. How was it given, and on what date. 2. Has the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario submitted any offer for the property, assets and undertaking of the Ontario Power Service Corporation in connection with the Judicial Sale advertised in the Toronto Telegram, March 6. If so, what was the offer. 3. Is the law firm of Tille, Johnson, Thomson and Parmenter representing the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario in this matter as well as the vendors, the Montreal Trust Company.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

Answers to Questions 1, 2 and 3:—

On 5th August, 1932, the Montreal Trust Company was, by letter from the Chairman of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, requested to act as depositary for the Commission in connection with the public offer of that date made by the Commission to the bondholders of the Ontario Power Service Corporation.

The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario in the judicial proceedings tendered \$14,000,000 for the property. In these proceedings Tilley, Johnson, Thomson and Parmenter were acting only for the Montreal Trust Company.

Mr. Newman asked the following Question (No. 118):—

1. When did the office of Local Registrar of the Supreme Court at Lindsay become vacant. 2. Who has since been performing the duties of this office. 3. Why has an appointment not been made.

The Honourable the Attorney-General replied as follows:—

1. June 3rd, 1931. 2. J. E. Anderson, K.C., Clerk of the Peace, *ex officio*. 3. No one as yet selected for the position.

Mr. Ross asked the following Question (No. 123):—

1. What was the total value of the output of the Ontario mines in the last fiscal year. 2. How much was received by the Provincial Treasurer during the same period, under The Mining Tax Act, or any other taxing Act of the Province affecting the mining industry.

The Honourable the Minister of Mines replied as follows:—

All the records of output of the mines are made according to the calendar year, and according to The Mining Tax Act it is the calendar year which must be used. Thus, the last tax payable in the fiscal year ending October 31st, 1932,

was based on the operations of the calendar year 1931. This question must, therefore, be answered on the basis of the calendar year ending December 31st, 1931.

1. For the calendar year ending December 31st, 1931, the total value of the output of the Ontario mines was \$95,643,207, of which \$72,452,544 was metal valuation. 2. The total tax levied on the mining industry for the year 1931 by The Mining Tax Act and other taxing Acts of the Province affecting the mining industry was: (a) The amount paid by the Profit Tax under The Mining Tax Act was \$733,137.93, of which \$217,984.34 was payable and was paid to the municipalities in which the mines were situated as provided by the Act, and was deducted from the total shown above, leaving \$515,153.59 as the amount due and paid the Provincial Treasurer. (b) Acreage taxes and mining leases paid during calendar year ending December 31st, 1931, \$31,594.69. (c) Under The Mining Tax Act the Natural Gas Tax paid during the calendar year ending December 31st, 1931, was \$14,862.18. (d) Mining companies paying taxes under The Mining Tax Act also paid Corporation Tax for the calendar year 1931 to the amount of \$133,451.25.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 125):—

1. How many firms or companies were assessed under The Apprenticeship Act in the years 1931 and 1932. 2. How many firms or companies assessed under The Apprenticeship Act have failed to pay their levy for the years 1931 and 1932. 3. Has the Government taken any action to collect the unpaid levies under the Act. 4. What was the total levy collected by the Government under The Apprenticeship Act during 1930, 1931 and 1932. 5. What is the total cost to date under The Apprenticeship Act (1) by the Government; (2) by assessment. 6. How many apprentices under the Act are enrolled at the present time. 7. How many first-year apprentices were enrolled during the years 1930, 1931 and 1932.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works and Labour replied as follows:—

1. 1931, 2,840. 1932, Nil. 2. 1931, 291. 1932, Nil. 3. Yes. 4. 1930, \$41,882. 1931, \$29,341. 1932, Nil. 5. (1) By Government from June 1st, 1928, to March 31st, 1933, \$118,659.14. 1928, \$2,641.88. 1929, \$22,691.01. 1930, \$29,866.43. 1931, \$26,541.87. 1932, \$26,436.27. 1933, \$10,481.68. (2) From Assessment Fund, \$61,775.50. 1931, \$29,472.00. 1932, \$24,050.50. 1933, \$8,253.00. 6. 781. 7. 1930, 156. 1931, 95. 1932, 61.

Mr. Slack asked the following Question (No. 135):—

1. Who are the members of the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Parks Commission. 2. What was the date of appointment of each. 3. What remuneration does each member receive. 4. What amount of money in expenses was drawn by each member during the last fiscal year. 5. Does the Government pay anything

toward the expenses of this Commission. If so, how much. 6. Does the Province receive any revenues from the activities of the Commission. If so, how much.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. R. Home Smith, Chairman, April 30th, 1929. Lieut.-Col. L. C. Raymond, K.C., June 14th, 1905. William L. Doran, October 11th, 1907. Hon. J. D. Chaplin, M.P., September 9th, 1910. Dr. H. Y. Grant, April 29th, 1914. Hon. Geo. S. Henry, B.A., LL.D., September 12th, 1923. David M. Wright, M.P., November 29th, 1929. 2. See No. 1. 3. The Commissioners receive their actual disbursements but no remuneration. 4. R. Home Smith, Nil. Col. L. C. Raymond, Nil. William L. Doran, Nil. Hon. J. D. Chaplin, Nil. Dr. H. Y. Grant, Nil. Hon. Geo. S. Henry, Nil. David M. Wright, for 1931, \$27.25; for 1932, \$39.25. 5. No. 6. Any surplus revenue is payable to the Provincial Treasurer. Outside of Queenston Power Plant rentals there was paid to the Provincial Treasurer from 1924 to 1928 the sum of \$920,997.00.

Mr. Taylor asked the following Question (No. 137):—

1. What is the number of first and second-year apprentices now enrolled under The Apprenticeship Act. What numbers were there in 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932. 2. Has there been any diminution of the staff since 1930. If so, by how many. 3. What was the reason for holding classes in Hamilton this year, and what extra expense was entailed. 4. (a) Who are the members of the Apprentice Board. (b) What is the qualification of each for the work. (c) What remuneration and expenses did each draw in the last fiscal year. 5. What was the total cost to the Province for each of the last three fiscal years in administering this Act. 6. What has been the total amount received in payment of assessments from the trades under the Act, since its inception. How much stands to the credit of the fund now.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works and Labour replied as follows:—

1. 1929, 153. 1930, 543. 1931, 274. 1932, 168. 1933, 101. 2. Yes, by one. 3. The number of first and second-year apprentices was not sufficient to require special day classes in more than one centre and they were held where the best accommodation was available. No extra expense was involved. There was a considerable saving. 4. (a) J. B. Carswell, Chairman of the Board, Managing Director of the Burlington Steel Company, Hamilton. Ernest Ingles, International Vice-President, Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, London. F. S. Rutherford, Director of Vocational Education, Provincial Department of Education, Toronto. (b) Mr. Carswell is a former general contractor. He has been very active in promoting apprenticeship and is thoroughly familiar with the problems involved. He represents employers. Mr. Ingles represents employees in the building trades and has been very active in the work since the beginning. Mr. Rutherford supervises and arranges for the education and training of apprentices in the school classes. (c) Mr. Carswell, \$538.20. Mr. Ingles, \$226.60. Mr. Rutherford, \$93.30. 5. 1930, \$29,866.43. 1931, \$26,541.87. 1932, \$26,436.27. 6. Amount collected in assessments, \$70,918.00. Balance on hand, \$11,261.00.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 117), An Act to amend The Public Service Works on Highways Act.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

Bill (No. 124), The School Law Amendment Act, 1933.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 128), An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 121), An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, having been read,

Mr. Nixon moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on the following Division:—

YEAS

Baxter	Mackay	Robertson
Blakelock	Medd	Ross
Bragg	Murray	Sangster
Elliott	McQuibban	Simpson
(Bruce, North)	Newman	Sinclair
Hipel	Nixon	Slack
Hutchinson	Oliver	Taylor
		Tweed—21.

NAYS

Acres	Coté	Harrison
Bell	Craig	Heighington
Berry	Davis	Henry
Black	Ellis	(York, East)
Blanchard	Finlayson	Henry
Calder	Freele	(Kent, East)
Challies	Graves	Hill
Clark	Hambly	Honeywell
Cooke	Harcourt	Ireland

NAYS—Continued

Jamieson	McArthur	Seguin
Jutten	McCrea	Shaver
Kennedy	McLean	Shields
(Temiskaming)	McMillen	Singer
Kennedy	McNaughton	Skinner
(Peel)	Nesbitt	Smith
Lancaster	Poisson	(Essex, South)
Laughton	Price	Smith
Lyons	(Parkdale)	(Greenwood)
Macaulay	Price	Spence
Martin	(York, West)	Staples
(Hamilton)	Reid	Stedman
Martin	Richardson	Wilson
(Brantford)	Robb	(Windsor, East)
Murphy	St. Denis	Wilson—62.
(St. Patrick)	Scholfield	(Lincoln)

And so it was declared in the Negative.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1933, the following sums:—

2. To defray the expenses of the Legislation.....	\$ 7,080 00
3. To defray the expenses of the Prime Minister.....	215,711 00
5. To defray the expenses of the Attorney-General.....	3,000 00
6. To defray the expenses of the Insurance Department.....	825 00
7-31. To defray the expenses of the Education Department.....	1,883,230 00
35. To defray the expenses of the Game and Fisheries Department	4,375 00
34. To defray the expenses of the Mines Department.....	31,990 50
36. To defray the expenses of the Public Works Department....	732,916 36
38-39. To defray the expenses of the Health Department.....	483,655 00
40. To defray the expenses of the Labour Department.....	34,925 00
41. To defray the expenses of the Welfare Department.....	36,624 25
42. To defray the expenses of the Provincial Treasurer's Department.....	32,125 00
43. To defray the expenses of the Provincial Auditor's Department.....	7,625 00
44-45. To defray the expenses of the Provincial Secretary's Department.....	15,500 00
46-62. To defray the expenses of the Agriculture Department....	125,774 11

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-morrow.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Return to an Order of the House, That there be laid before this House a Return showing: 1. The contract made between the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and the Beauharnois Power Company, November, 1929, for 250,000 h.p. 2. Order-in-Council confirming this contract. 3. Copies of all correspondence pertaining thereto. (*Sessional Papers No. 47.*)

Also, Report of the Ontario Research Foundation—on a Technical and Economic Investigation of Northern Ontario Lignite. (*Sessional Papers No. 46.*)

The House then adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

THURSDAY, APRIL 6TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Price, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Eighth Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills without amendment:—

Bill (No. 14), An Act respecting The Essex Border Utilities Commission.

Bill (No. 25), An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg.

Bill (No. 34), An Act respecting the College of Ottawa.

Your Committee beg to report the following Bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 7, An Act respecting The United Farmers Co-operative Association.

Bill (No. 13), An Act respecting The Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Electric Railway Association.

Bill (No. 26), An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill (No. 27), An Act to incorporate Thousand Islands Bridge Company.

Bill (No. 42), An Act respecting the Township of York.

Your Committee beg to report that it considered Bill (No. 45), An Act respecting Hairdressers and Barbers, and recommends that there be substituted for the provisions contained in the said Bill other provisions.

Bills (No. 8), Respecting The Western Savings and Loan Association; (No. 10), Respecting the Townships of Drummond, North Elmsley, Beckwith and Montague; (No. 21), Town of Weston; and (No. 43), Respecting Ferranti Electric Limited, are not reported by your Committee, having been withdrawn by the sponsors thereof, and the Committee recommends that the fees in connection with these Bills, less penalties and expenses incurred, be remitted.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 138), intituled "An Act to amend The Veterinary Science Act." *Mr. Kennedy* (Peel).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 139), intituled "An Act respecting the Sale and Inspection of Fruit." *Mr. Kennedy* (Peel).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 140), intituled "An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act." *Mr. Henry* (York East).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 141), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act." *Mr. Henry* (York East).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 142), intituled "An Act to amend The Civil Service Act." *Mr. Henry* (York East).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 143), intituled "An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 144), intituled "An Act to amend The Mercantile Law Amendment Act." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 145), intituled "The Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1933." *Mr. Finlayson*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The following Bills were read the third time and were passed:—

Bill (No. 60), An Act respecting Collection Agencies.

Bill (No. 83), An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Bill (No. 106), An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

Bill (No. 53), An Act to amend The Marriage Act.

Bill (No. 89), An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Bill (No. 115), An Act to amend The Stenographic Reporters' Act.

Bill (No. 114), An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

Bill (No. 102), The Northern Ontario Appropriation Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 126), An Act to amend The Bulk Sales Act.

Bill (No. 112), An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill (No. 40), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 47), An Act respecting the Town of Walkerville.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 49), The Mortgagors' and Purchasers' Relief Act, 1933, having been read.

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 129), An Act respecting Insurance.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 118), An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 122), An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 123), An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 124), The School Law Amendment Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the House to go into Committee of Supply having been read, Mr. Henry (York East) moved

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

Mr. Nixon moved in Amendment, seconded by Mr. Slack,

That the motion that the Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply be amended by adding thereto the following words: but this House first asserts its inherent right to have all necessary information, data, and explanation, including answers to questions by Members, return of documents and orders of the House regarding expenditures of the Departments of the Government and Commissions appointed by the Government, and in this instance in particular demands an immediate statement as to the salaries of the following officials of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, the date of the last increase in salary and the amount of the increase in each instance: (a) Mr. F. A. Gaby, Chief Engineer; (b) W. W. Pope, Secretary to the Commission; (c) Mr. I. B. Lucas, Solicitor to the Commission; (d) Dr. T. H. Hogg, Chief Hydraulic Engineer; (e) E. T. J. Brandon, Chief Electrical Engineer; (f) R. T. Jaffray, Chief Municipal Engineer; (g) W. R. Robertson, Chief of the Railway Division; (h) H. C. Don Carlos, Chief Operating Engineer; (i) W. G. Pierdon, Chief Accountant; (j) A. E. Davidson, Chief of Transmission and Redistribution; (k) W. P. Dobson, Chief of Testing and Research Department.

And a Debate having ensued after some time,

The Amendment to the Motion was put and lost on the following Division:—

YEAS

Baxter
Blakelock
Bragg
Elliott
(Bruce, North)
Hipel
Hutchinson

Mackay
Medd
Murray
McQuibban
Newman
Nixon

Oliver
Robertson
Ross
Simpson
Sinclair
Taylor
Tweed—19.

NAYS

Aubin	Honeywell	Price
Baird	Ireland	(York, West)
Black	Jamieson	Reid
Blanchard	Kennedy	Richardson
Case	(Temiskaming)	Robb
Challies	Kenning	St. Denis
Clark	Lancaster	Scholfield
Cooke	Laughton	Seguin
Craig	Macaulay	Shaver
Elliott	Mahony	Singer
(Rainy River)	Martin	Skinner
Finlayson	(Brantford)	Smith
Freele	Monteith	(Essex, South)
Graham	Morrison	Spence
Harcourt	Murphy	Staples
Harrison	(St. Patrick)	Vaughan
Heighington	Murphy	Wilson
Henry	(Beaches)	(Windsor, East)
(York, East)	McArthur	Wilson—52.
Hill	McLean	(Lincoln)
Hogarth	Nesbitt	

PAIRS

Sangster

McNaughton

And the House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1933, the following sums:—

4. To defray the expenses of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission.....\$1,225,000 00
32. To defray the expenses of the Lands and Forests Department 82,650 00

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the

Committee had come to several Resolutions; also, That the Committee had directed him to ask for leave to sit again.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-morrow

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House then adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

FRIDAY, APRIL 7TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

On motion of Mr. Harcourt, seconded by Mr. Harrison,

Ordered, That leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Municipal Act," and that the provisions of Rules No. 36 and No. 56 of this House be suspended so far as they apply to this motion.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 146), intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act." *Mr. Harcourt*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 147), intituled "The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1933." *Mr. Price* (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 148), intituled "An Act to amend The Companies Act." *Mr. Challies*.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 149), intituled "An Act to amend The Wolf Bounty Act." *Mr. Challies*.

Ordered, that the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 150), intituled "The Public Vehicle Act, 1933." *Mr. Macaulay.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 151), intituled "The Public Commercial Vehicle Act, 1933." *Mr. Macaulay.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 152), intituled "The Manitoulin Rural Power District Act." *Mr. Cooke.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Bill (No. 153), intituled "The Power Commission Act, 1933." *Mr. Cooke.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 96):—

1. What has been the total cost to date of constructing and equipping the laboratories of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. 2. What was the total cost during the last fiscal year for maintaining the same. 3. What amount was paid during the last fiscal year for salaries of those engaged in the laboratories.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. The laboratory equipment is housed in and occupies a portion of the Commission's Service Building at Strachan Avenue, Toronto. The cost of the laboratory equipment is \$210,176.77.

Accumulated Reserves—Renewals.....	\$160,319.90
Sinking Fund.....	38,367.97
	<hr/>
	\$198,687.87

2. The amount spent for maintenance of equipment was \$3,014.44. 3. The salaries paid to laboratory workers was \$44,576.25.

Mr. McQuibban asked the following Question (No. 117):—

1. What amount, if any, was taken from the contingent fund of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission during the last fiscal year beyond the amount used to pay exchange. 2. If so, for what purpose was it expended.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

RESERVES FOR OBSOLESCENCE, CONTINGENCIES AND STABILIZATION TO OCTOBER 31st, 1932

	Niagara System	Georgian Bay System	Eastern Ontario System	Thunder Bay System	Sudbury District	Total
	\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.
Balances, October 31st, 1931.....	14,631,725 88	343,464 51	1,254,868 33	920,639 40	54,392 24	17,205,090 36
Additions in the year ending October 31st, 1932.....	819,784 68	67,995 86	227,767 90	36,957 94	75,964 85	1,228,471 23
Totals.....	15,451,510 56	411,460 37	1,482,636 23	957,597 34	130,357 09	18,433,561 59
DEDUCT						
Contingencies met with during the year incidental to plant operations..	61,428 13	4,090 21	118,909 69			
Difference between the revenue received from private companies and other power customers operating under flat rate contracts, and the result obtained by "costing" these loads on exactly the same basis as that used in determining "costs" in respect of municipal contracts, including sinking fund, \$531,584.00 and renewals, \$351,994.40.....	1,949,367 83			41,499 15		
Commission's share of American Exchange paid during the year by the Province of Ontario on the transfer of funds to New York to meet capital retirements, less profit on English Exchange in connection with the transfer of funds to London to retire debenture stock.....	402,109 98	39,985 87	48,991 81	102,857 13	28,641 10	
NOTE.—This is exclusive of exchange on interest coupons.						
Amount appropriated from the Contingency Reserve and applied proportionately to each municipality in reduction of the costs of delivery of power thereto.....	595,280 80			102,000 00		
Total Deductions.....	3,008,186 74	44,076 08	167,901 50	246,356 28	28,641 10	3,495,161 70
Balance, October 31st, 1932.....	12,443,323 82	367,384 29	1,314,734 73	711,241 06	101,715 99	14,938,399 89

Mr. Medd asked the following Question (No. 113):—

1. What is the total amount of insurance carried by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario. 2. What is the total amount of insurance carried with Canadian insurance companies. 3. What are the names of the Canadian and American insurance companies with which the Hydro-Electric Power Commission carries insurance and the amount of insurance carried in each company.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. \$12,724,074.00. 2. \$1,933,473.33.

3.—

Aetna Insurance Company	\$204,350.00
Alliance Insurance Company of Philadelphia	18,500.00
American Alliance Insurance Company	500,000.00
American Central Insurance Company	34,939.33
American Colony Insurance Company	3,000.00
American Equitable Assurance Company	5,000.00
Blackstone Mutual Fire Insurance Company	232,000.00
British America Assurance Company	7,500.00
British Northwestern Fire Insurance Company	156,997.50
California Insurance Company	7,350.00
Canada National Fire Insurance Company	2,900.00
Canadian Fire Insurance Company	12,500.00
Canadian Indemnity Company	15,750.00
Century Insurance Company, Limited	4,620.00
Continental Insurance Company of New York	351,200.00
Dominion of Canada General Insurance Company	2,000.00
Fire Insurance Company of Canada	7,500.00
Fireman's Fund Insurance Company	250,000.00
Fireman's Mutual Fire Insurance Company	252,000.00
Franklin Fire Insurance Company of Philadelphia	29,300.00
Globe Indemnity Company of Canada	1,098,935.83
Globe Underwriters Agency	250.00
Great American Insurance Company	250.00
Halifax Fire Insurance Company	2,500.00
Hanover Fire Insurance Company	5,683.34
Hartford Fire Insurance Company	6,160.00
Home Insurance Company of New York	300,600.00
Homestead Fire Insurance Company	333,657.50
Hope Mutual Fire Insurance Company	50,000.00
Imperial Guarantee & Accident Company of Canada	34,000.00
Imperial Insurance Company of New York	700.00
Insurance Company of North America	1,277,250.00
Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania	193,392.50
London-Canada Insurance Company	4,500.00
London Guarantee & Accident Company	150,000.00
London & Lancashire Guarantee & Accident Company of Canada	54,680.00
Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company	1,451,600.00
Mercantile Fire Insurance Company	18,000.00
Merchants Fire Insurance Company	6,500.00
Merchants Mutual Fire Insurance Company	158,400.00
Mercury Insurance Company	250.00
National-Ben Franklin Fire Insurance Company	2,500.00
National Fire Insurance Company of Hartford	75,000.00
National Liverpool Insurance Company	100,800.00
National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburg	22,636.00
New Hampshire Fire Insurance Company	80,360.00
New York Underwriters Insurance Company	766,250.00
North West Fire Insurance Company	500.00
Occidental Fire Insurance Company	1,600.00
Pacific Insurance Company of New York	57,000.00
Philadelphia Mutual Fire Insurance Company	116,000.00
Phoenix Insurance Company of Hartford	1,500.00
Pioneer Insurance Company	13,350.00
Provident Assurance Company	41,912.50
Queen City Fire Insurance Company	64,247.50
Queen Insurance Company of America	77,500.00
Saint Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company	250.00
Saltfleet & Binbrook Mutual Fire Insurance Company	7,700.00
Scottish Canadian Assurance Company	250.00
Springfield Fire & Marine Insurance Company	500,000.00
St. Lawrence Underwriters	5,000.00
United States Fire Insurance Company	967,000.00
Wellington Fire Insurance Company	119,500.00
Westchester Fire Insurance Company	16,236.00
Western Assurance Company	4,000.00
What Cheer Mutual Fire Insurance Company	60,000.00
Winnipeg Fire Insurance Company	350.00
World Fire & Marine Insurance Company of Hartford	200,000.00

\$10,546,158.00

A substantial portion of the above insurance is held by trustees under bond mortgages and carried with Mutual and other American Companies which, in most cases, were on the risks when the properties were acquired by the Commission. Other insurance carried with British Companies.

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 100):—

1. Who are the auditors of the accounts of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. 2. What was paid to them for their services during the last fiscal year. 3. Is the audit of the accounts of the Commission made yearly. 4. When was the last audit completed. 5. Is the report of their audit available to the public.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. Clarkson, Gordon, Dilworth, Guilfoyle and Nash, Chartered Accountants, Toronto. 2. Annual fee, \$35,000.00 in accordance with Order-in-Council dated February 11th, 1931. 3. Carried on continuously throughout the year and reported upon to the Government following the close of the Commission's accounts. 4. Current audit of accounts completed concurrently with the closing of the Commission's accounts as at October 31st each year, and the year and statements verified as rapidly as possible when made available by the Accountants and Engineers of the Commission. Audit report for the fiscal year (1931-32) in progress. 5. The yearly reports in the hands of the Prime Minister and copies in the hands of the Commission but not distributed in printed form.

Mr. Sangster asked the following Question (No. 124):—

1. How many miles of rural Hydro lines have been constructed in the County of Glengarry. 2. How many farm service contracts have been signed by farmers who are now being supplied with electric service in said county.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. The construction of rural lines by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario is undertaken within the limits of rural power districts as provided for by The Power Commission Act. The lines constructed in these districts are for the purpose of serving consumers in the defined area without reference to township or county boundaries. Therefore the rural primary lines erected in the different townships were not necessarily erected for the purpose of delivering power to consumers in their respective townships. The total rural primary lines located in the County of Glengarry as at October 31st, 1932, amounted to 55.94 miles. 2. There are now 241 rural consumers served in the county under the following classifications: Class 1B, 121; Class 1C, 45; Class 2A, 11; Class 2B, 2; Class 3, 48; Class 4, 6; Class 6A, 6; Class Power, 2.

Mr. Murray asked the following Question (No. 130):—

1. How many Gunnings have been paid by cheques from the Highway Department since 1926, on the Talbotville Division, County of Elgin. 2. What amount of money per day does the foreman, J. R. Gunning, draw. 3. What has been the total amount paid him since 1926, for man and truck. 4. How many cheques has W. Fife received since 1929, and what were the amounts. 5. How many cheques has Ward Eckford received since 1929 and what amount per cheque.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

1. Three, employed at various times. 2. \$4.00 a day when employed. 3. \$1,364.00. 4. Three: \$6.05, \$37.95 and \$44.00 in the year 1930. 5. Twenty-two: \$6.05, \$3.30, \$3.30, \$12.10, \$3.30, \$6.60, \$6.00, \$19.80, \$22.00, \$28.60, \$20.35, \$4.40, \$1.50, \$3.30, \$4.40, \$22.55, \$19.80, \$23.10, \$18.70, \$27.50, \$41.80, \$12.00.

Mr. Simpson asked the following Question (No. 131):—

1. What salary is paid to Mr. McPherson for his services as Superintendent of London Division, Department of Highways. 2. What salary is paid to Mr. Shipley as foreman on No. 3 Highway (Chatham Division). 3. How many cheques has George Palmer received since 1929. 4. How many cheques has Mr. Fish received since 1929.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

1. \$3,300.00 less superannuation and salary assessment. 2. \$4.00 a day when employed. 3. Two. 4. None.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 130), An Act to amend The Woodmen's Lien for Wages Act.

Referred to the Committee on Legal Bills.

Bill (No. 132), An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Referred to the Committee on Municipal Laws.

Bill (No. 7), An Act respecting the United Farmers' Co-operative Association.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 13), An Act respecting the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Railway Association.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 14), An Act respecting the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 25), An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 26), An Act respecting the City of London.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 27), An Act to incorporate Thousand Islands Bridge Company.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 34), An Act respecting the College of Ottawa.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 42), An Act respecting the Township of York.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 45), An Act respecting Hairdressers and Barbers.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 135), An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowance Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 134), An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 143), An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Bill (No. 144), An Act to amend The Mercantile Law Amendment Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 131), An Act respecting Equities of Redemption in Residence Properties, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

Mr. Mahony, from the Committee of Supply, reported the following Resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One Thousand, nine hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Lieutenant-Governor's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1933.
2. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven thousand and eighty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Legislation for the year ending 31st October, 1933.
3. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and fifteen thousand, seven hundred and eleven dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Prime Minister's Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.
4. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million, two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Hydro-Electric Power Commission for the year ending 31st October, 1933.
5. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Attorney-General's Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.
6. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eight hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Insurance Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.
- 7-31. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million, eight hundred and eighty-three thousand, two hundred and thirty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Education Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.
32. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-two thousand, six hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Lands and Forests Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.
34. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-one thousand, nine hundred and ninety dollars and fifty cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Mines Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.
35. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand, three hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Game and Fisheries Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.

36. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven hundred and thirty-two thousand, nine hundred and sixteen thousand dollars and thirty-six cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Works Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.

38-39. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four hundred and eighty-three thousand, six hundred and fifty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Health Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.

40. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-four thousand, nine hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Labour Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.

41. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-six thousand, six hundred and twenty-four dollars and twenty-five cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Welfare Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.

42. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-two thousand, one hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial Treasurer's Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.

43. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven thousand, six hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial Auditor's Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.

44-45. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifteen thousand, five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial Secretary's Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.

46-62. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and twenty-five thousand, seven hundred and seventy-four dollars and eleven cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Agriculture Department for the year ending 31st October, 1933.

The several Resolutions, having been read a second time, were concurred in.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Civil Service Commissioner of Ontario for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 51.*)

Also, Report of the Department of Agriculture, Ontario, for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 21.*)

Also, Report of the Statistics Branch, Ontario Department of Agriculture, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 22.*)

Also, Annual Report upon the Hospitals and Sanitoria of Ontario for year ending September 30th, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 17.*)

Also, Annual Report upon Hospitals for Mentally Ill, Mentally Subnormal and Epileptic for period ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 15.*)

Also, Annual Report of Department of Highways, Ontario. (*Sessional Papers No. 48.*)

Also, Annual Report of Department of Mines, Ontario, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 4.*)

Also, Report of Registrar of Loan Corporations for Province of Ontario for year ending December 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 7.*)

Also, Report of the Superintendent of Insurance for year ending December 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 6.*)

Also, Minutes of Meetings of Special Committee of the Legislature on Game and Fish, February-March, 1933. (*Sessional Papers No. 49.*)

Also, Report of the Provincial Auditor, Ontario, 1931-1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 27.*)

Also, Report of the Secretary and Registrar of the Province of Ontario with respect to the Administration of The Companies Act, The Extra Provincial Corporations Act, The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, and The Companies Information Act for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 50.*)

Also, Report of Ontario Veterinary College for year 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 29.*)

The House then adjourned at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 10TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Black presented the Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, which was read as follows, and adopted:—

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario:

Your Committee has had produced before it documents and correspondence and heard evidence in connection with the following items in the Public Accounts, 1932:—

Construction of Breslau Bridge, Waterloo County, Pages L 18, 19, 20, 21, Public Accounts.

B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd., Furniture, \$650.00, furniture and furnishings for buildings, Page K 17, Public Accounts.

Your Committee held in all two meetings and examined the following witnesses: R. M. Smith, Deputy Minister of Highways; George Hogarth, Deputy Minister of Public Works; H. P. Rickard, B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd.

Mr. Finlayson, from the Standing Committee on Municipal Law, presented their First Report which was as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee have carefully considered the provisions of Bills (Nos. 65, 95, and 132), To amend The Municipal Act, and such of their provisions as have been approved of have been embodied in a Bill intituled "The Municipal Amendment Act, 1933."

Your Committee have carefully considered the provisions of Bills (Nos. 64, 93, and 116), To amend The Assessment Act, and such of their provisions as have been approved of have been embodied in a Bill intituled "The Assessment Amendment Act, 1933."

Your Committee have carefully considered the provisions of Bills (Nos. 74, and 80), To amend The Local Improvement Act, and such of their provisions as have been approved of have been embodied in a Bill intituled "The Local Improvement Amendment Act, 1933."

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bills and beg to report the same with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 54), An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act.

Bill (No. 61), An Act to Conserve and Improve the Valley of the Don River.

Bill (No. 63), An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act.

Your Committee have carefully considered the following Bill and beg to report the same without amendment:—

Bill (No. 113), An Act to amend The Cemetery Act.

Your Committee have also carefully considered Bills (Nos. 50, 62, 87, 103), To amend The Municipal Act, and Bills (Nos. 76, 79, 88, 98, and 104), To amend The Assessment Act and recommend that the same be not further proceeded with.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

That the Select Committee of this House appointed to consider the best Means of Improving the Method of Preparing the Voters' Lists on which the Provincial Elections are held, be granted permission to sit concurrently with the House.

Mr. Henry delivered to Mr. Speaker a message from the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by himself; and the said message was read by Mr. Speaker, and is as follows:—

HERBERT ALEXANDER BRUCE

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the year ending 31st October, 1934, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
Toronto, April 10th, 1933.

(*Sessional Papers No. 2.*)

Ordered, That the message of the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the Estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 154), intituled "An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act."
Mr. Challies.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 155), intituled "An Act respecting the Operation of Commercial Motor Vehicles." *Mr. Hutchinson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 156), intituled "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act."
Mr. Nixon.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 157), intituled "The Municipal Amendment Act, 1933." *Mr. Finlayson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 158), intituled "The Assessment Amendment Act, 1933." *Mr. Finlayson.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 159), intituled "The Local Improvement Amendment Act, 1933."
Mr. Finlayson.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 160), intituled "An Act for Raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund." *Mr. Henry* (York East).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 161), intituled "An Act respecting Unemployment Relief." *Mr. Henry* (York East).

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

On motion of Mr. McQuibban, seconded by Mr. Sinclair,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing: What is the amount in each of the years 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932, by which the totals of Revenue and Expenditure are reduced by the adoption of the new system of bookkeeping by which cross entries are eliminated.

Mr. Murray asked the following Question (No. 76):—

1. How much land has been (a) leased; (b) purchased; (c) expropriated for forestry purposes under the provisions of The Forestry Act, R.S.O. 1927, Cap. 41, since the passing of said Act. 2. How much money has been spent under the provisions of said Act, for such purposes since the passing of the Act. 3. How many townships have been detached from unions of townships under Section 8 of said Act. 4. How many townships have been made parts of Crown Forests Reserves under Section 9 of said Act. 5. How many settlers have been removed from unsuitable locations to suitable places in Ontario under Section 13 of said Act. 6. How many have remained where located. 7. How many acres have been acquired by the Crown through such removal. 8. What has been the total cost to the Government of such removal.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. (a) Nil. (b) 187 acres. (c) Nil. 2. \$5,900.00. 3. None. 4. None. 5. Eleven heads of families comprising 44 souls. 6. Nine heads of families comprising 41 souls. 7. 1,318½ acres, with improvements. 8. \$16,212.30. Of this over 77 per cent. comprises cost of houses, barns, etc., balance, transportation, freight, seed and administration.

Mr. Bragg asked the following Question (No. 80):—

1. What are the names of the parties from East Simcoe who have received employment as foremen, overseers or superintendents in the camps for the unemployed in Northern Ontario for the year 1931-1932. 2. What positions did they hold. 3. How many days were each employed. 4. What was each paid per day.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

During the winter of 1931-32, 35,000 men were employed on relief work in Northern Ontario.

Name	Position	No. of days employed	Rate of Pay
Rawson, Otto.....	Superintendent	182	\$150.00 per month
Dutton, E.....	Superintendent	177	\$150.00 " "
Shakell, A.....	Gang Foreman	156	\$4.00 or \$3.00 per day less board
VanNorman, H. H...	"	170	" " "
Lockhart, F. J.....	"	90 $\frac{7}{8}$	" " "
Prentice, J.....	"	122	" " "
Orr, E. W.....	"	66 $\frac{1}{2}$	" " "
Orser, W. S.....	"	170 $\frac{3}{4}$	" " "
Wood, E. A.....	"	169 $\frac{1}{2}$	" " "
Annis, C.....	"	100	" " "
Coones, Miles.....	"	53	" " "
Truax, Abe.....	"	89 $\frac{5}{8}$	" " "

Mr. Baxter asked the following Question (No. 110):—

1. How many loans have been granted to rural Hydro consumers under The Rural Power Districts Loan Act.
2. How many loans have been applied for.
2. What is the total amount of such loans.

The Honourable Mr. Cooke replied as follows:—

1. 347 up to April 1st, 1933.
2. 451 up to April 1st, 1933.
3. \$79,697, less principal due of \$12,944 on March 1st, practically all of which has been paid.

Mr. Bragg asked the following Question (No. 133):—

1. What Crown Lands Offices have been closed by the Department of Lands and Forests since November 1st, 1931.
2. What is the name of the agent who occupied each of said offices, and the yearly salary of the same.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. Parry Sound: Consolidated with office of Crown Timber Agent. Former Agent, Miss I. M. Campbell, salary, \$650.

2. Mattawa: Consolidated with office of Crown Timber Agent, North Bay. Former Agent, J. A. Fink, salary, \$500.

3. Magnetawan: Service being performed at headquarters, Toronto. Former Agent, J. S. Freeborn, salary, \$500.

4. Sturgeon Falls: Arrangements pending. Former Agent, J. P. Marchildon, salary, \$487.75.

5. New Liskeard: Consolidated with office of Crown Timber Agent. Former Agent, J. R. MacCrea, salary, \$1,400.

In the following offices part-time Agents are now acting without salary:—

Espanola: Edward Arthurs, former salary, \$600.

Stratton: Wm. Cameron, former salary, \$500.

Hilton Beach: W. J. Trainor, former salary, \$300.

Kinmount: A. N. Wilson, former salary, \$175.

Pembroke: Finlay Watt, former salary, \$300.

Mr. Murray asked the following Question (No. 138):—

1. What undeveloped waterpowers are held by the Great Lakes Paper Company, Limited, under lease from the Crown. 2. What is the estimated horsepower of the waterpowers held as above. 3. What sum per annum does the Province of Ontario receive on account of the leasing of the above waterpowers. 4. What is the total amount received to date by the Province of Ontario on account of the above waterpowers.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. (a) Waterpower on the Montreal River in Township 29, Range 15, District of Algoma. (b) Waterpower on Montreal River, Township 27, Range 15, District of Algoma. 2. At minimum flow 2,845 and 2,922 horsepower respectively. 3. Annual rental, \$500 each for the first five years; afterwards, 25 cents per horsepower, with a minimum rental of \$1,000 each. 4. \$2,000.

Mr. Slack asked the following Question (No. 139):—

1. (a) What was the total cost to the Province in refurnishing Members' Lounge Room No. 1. (b) What were the items making up this order and cost of each item. 2. (a) From what firm or firms was the furniture purchased. What is the address of each firm. (b) Was the order let by tender. If not, how were the arrangements made and when were they made. 3. (a) What was the cost of the table. (b) Who supplied the table and of what material is it constructed. 4. What was done with the furniture taken from the room. If sold, what was realized on it.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. (a) \$2,349.47.

(b)—

1 Table.....	\$309.75	2 Chairs.....	\$120.60
2 Radiator tops.....	60.00	6 Tub chairs.....	186.00
1 Telephone table.....	47.25	6 Tub chairs.....	204.72
4 End tables.....	48.00	2 Long bench cushions....	70.00
4 Low stands.....	46.00	Draperies.....	192.15
6 Tub chairs.....	113.40	12 Glass ash trays.....	6.00
4 Chesterfields.....	528.00	1 Clock.....	25.00
4 Chairs.....	240.00	Add for mahogany.....	35.00
1 Chesterfield.....	117.60		
			<hr/> \$2,349.47

2. (a) T. Eaton Company, Limited, Toronto, received the whole order with instructions to supply certain goods themselves and to purchase other specified articles from (1) Baetz Furniture Company, Kitchener, (2) Farquharson Gifford Company, Stratford, (3) Kroehler Manufacturing Company, Limited, Stratford. (b) Yes. 3. (a) \$309.75. (b) Baetz Furniture Company, Kitchener, mahogany. 4. All the furniture is in course of allotment for use throughout the Parliament Buildings.

Mr. Robertson asked the following Question (No. 141):—

1. Did any Department of the Government purchase a boat to be remodelled for use as a ferry to and from Manitoulin Island or adjacent waters. 2. If so, when and from whom. 3. When was the contract let for remodelling. 4. At what cost. 5. When were plans approved by the Department of Marine at Ottawa.

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests replied as follows:—

1. No Department of the Government has purchased a boat to be remodelled for use as a ferry on Manitoulin Island. The Department of Northern Development are building a ferry for use at Little Current. A contract was let after public tenders and after submitting plans to the Federal authorities. 2, 3, 4 and 5 answered by No. 1.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 136), An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 138), An Act to amend The Veterinary Science Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 139), An Act respecting the Sale and Inspection of Fruit.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 140), An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act.
Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 141), An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act.
Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 142), An Act to amend The Civil Service Act.
Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 145), The Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1933.
Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 147), The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1933.
Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 148), An Act to amend The Companies Act.
Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 149), An Act to amend The Wolf Bounty Act.
Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 152), The Manitoulin Rural Power District Act.
Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 153), The Power Commission Act, 1933.
Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 119), An Act to amend the Act of Incorporation of the Town of Kapuskasing, 11 George V, 1921, Chapter 36.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 150), The Public Vehicle Act, 1933.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 151), The Public Commercial Vehicle Act, 1933.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 129), An Act respecting Insurance, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker

resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 134), An Act to amend The Insurance Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 143), An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 144), An Act to amend The Mercantile Law Amendment Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 135), An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowance Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 128), An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report progress, and to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, severally to consider the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 7), An Act respecting the United Farmers' Co-operative Association.

Bill (No. 13), An Act respecting the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Electric Railway Association.

Bill (No. 14), An Act respecting the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

Bill (No. 25), An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg.

Bill (No. 26), An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill (No. 27), An Act to incorporate Thousand Islands Bridge Company.

Bill (No. 34), An Act respecting the College of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 42), An Act respecting the Township of York.

Bill (No. 45), An Act respecting Hairdressers and Barbers.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the several Bills without amendments.

Ordered, That the Bills reported, be severally read the third time To-morrow.

The following Bills were read the third time and were passed:—

Bill (No. 118), An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill (No. 122), An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Bill (No. 123), An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 146), An Act to amend The Municipal Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 28.*)

Also, Report of the Department of Game and Fisheries, Ontario, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 9.*)

The House then adjourned at 5.08 p.m.

TUESDAY, APRIL 11TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. McCrea, from the Standing Committee on Legal Bills, presented their Second and Final Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee begs to report the following Bill without amendment:—

Bill (No. 130), An Act to amend The Woodman's Lien for Wages Act.

Your Committee has considered the provisions of Bill (No. 71), An Act respecting the Publication and Distribution of Discriminating Matter; Bill (No. 127), An Act to amend The Division Courts Act; Bill (No. 117), An Act to amend The Public Service Works on Highways Act; Bill (No. 108), An Act to amend The Medical Act, and Bill (No. 78), an Act to amend The Judicature Act, and recommends that the Bills in question be not further proceeded with.

Your Committee has carefully considered the provisions of Bill (No. 78), An Act to amend The Judicature Act, and of Bill (No. 127), An Act to amend The Division Courts Act, and recommends that a Sub-committee of this Committee consisting of Messrs. Sinclair, Coté and Smith (Essex South) be authorized to study both these Acts during recess and be prepared to submit the result of their deliberations at the next Session of this House, the said Sub-committee to act without payment of fees during the recess.

Your Committee has considered the provisions of Bill (No. 108), An Act to amend The Medical Act and while it is recommended that the Bill be not further proceeded with, your Committee recognizes that the principle of the Bill possesses merits which are deserving of consideration and, therefore, recommend that a Select Committee be appointed composed of Mr. McCrea (Chairman), Messrs. Baird, Martin (Hamilton), Nesbitt, Robb and Slack, to meet during the recess for the purpose of studying the question and endeavouring to promote co-operative efforts by the Ontario Medical Association and the Osteopathic practitioners in the Province of Ontario, said Select Committee to act without fees.

In connection with Bill (No. 71), An Act respecting the Publication and Distribution of Discriminating Matter, the attention of this Committee has been drawn to certain practices whereby persons operating or owning places of public or private resort publicly advertise that their premises or accommodations are not open to persons of certain religious beliefs, colour, race and/or nationality, and whereas such practices are not in accordance with the best principles of British ideals and traditions, be it therefore resolved that this Committee record its disapproval and condemnation of all such practices.

Ordered, That a Sub-committee of this Committee consisting of Messrs. Sinclair, Coté and Smith (Essex South) be authorized to study Bill (No. 78), An Act to amend The Judicature Act, and Bill (No. 127), An Act to amend The Division Courts Act, during recess and be prepared to submit the result of their deliberations at the next Session of this House, the said Sub-committee to act without payment of fees during the recess.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed composed of Mr. McCrea (Chairman), Messrs. Baird, Martin (Hamilton), Nesbitt, Robb and Slack, to meet during the recess for the purpose of studying the provisions of Bill (No. 108), An Act to amend The Medical Act, said Select Committee to act without fees.

Mr. Price, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presented their Ninth Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your Committee beg to report the following Bill with certain amendments:—

Bill (No. 23), An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough.

Mr. Price, from the Select Committee appointed to consider means of Improving the Method of Preparing Provincial Voters' Lists, presented their Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

1. Bill (No. 66), being An Act to amend The Election Act, providing for compulsory voting, has been carefully considered, but considering the time at the disposal of the Committee it was felt that this Bill should not be reported.

2. Consideration has been given to cutting down the number of days required for a Provincial election and as a result a Bill dealing with this will be introduced for the consideration of the House. It provides for a reduction in the number of days for an election from 41 to 32.

3. Careful consideration also was given to the manner of preparing voters' lists in cities having a population of 10,000 and over, and for this purpose a Bill has been prepared which will be introduced for the consideration of the House.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 163), intituled "An Act to amend The Election Act." *Mr. Nesbitt.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

Bill (No. 162), intituled "An Act to amend The Voters' Lists Act." Mr. Nesbitt.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time To-morrow.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 137), An Act respecting the Acquisition of the Properties of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, having been read,

Mr. Henry (York East) moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And a Debate having arisen, the House having continued to sit until after midnight.

Wednesday, April 12th, 1933,

The Debate continued, and after some time, a vote having been taken, the motion for the second reading was carried on the following Division:—

YEAS

Acres	Ireland	Price
Aubin	Jamieson	(Parkdale)
Baird	Jutten	Price
Bell	Kennedy	(York, West)
Berry	(Temiskaming)	Raven
Black	Kennedy	Richardson
Blanchard	(Peel)	Robb
Burt	Kenning	St. Denis
Case	Lancaster	Sanderson
Challies	Laughton	Scholfield
Cooke	Macaulay	Seguin
Coté	Mahony	Shields
Craig	Martin	Singer
Davis	(Hamilton)	Skinner
Elliott	Martin	Smith
(Rainy River)	(Brantford)	(Essex, South)
Finlayson	Monteith	Smith
Freele	Moore	(Greenwood)
Graham	Murphy	Spence
Graves	(St. Patrick)	Staples
Hambly	Murphy	Stedman
Harcourt	(Beaches)	Strickland
Harrison	McArthur	Vaughan
Heighington	McBrien	Willson
Henry	McCrea	(Niagara Falls)
(York, East)	McLean	Wilson
Henry	McMillen	(Windsor, East)
(Kent, East)	McNaughton	Wilson
Hill	Nesbitt	(Lincoln)
Honeywell	Poisson	Wright—74.

NAYS

Baxter	Murray	Ross
Blakelock	McQuibban	Sangster
Hipel	Newman	Simpson
Mackay	Nixon	Sinclair
Medd	Oliver	Slack
Munro	Robertson	Taylor—18.

PAIRS

Dunlop

Elliott

(Bruce North)

And the Bill was accordingly read a second time.

Mr. McCrea, from the Select Committee appointed to consider a Matter of Privilege, presented their Report which was read as follows and adopted—

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

Gentlemen:

The Select Committee of this House appointed to inquire into and report to this House upon the matters hereinafter set forth, viz.:—

The statement contained in the Toronto Daily Star in its issue of March 10th, that one Gordon Waldron, K.C., is reputed to have said and charged as follows:

"If you ask me to state my convictions, I would say that he is being paid to promote that Bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country, exposing himself, I think, to criminal prosecution;"

The said statement and charge refer to a certain Bill introduced in the House by the Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick in the City of Toronto on March 6th, 1933, being Bill (No. 82), entitled "An Act to repeal The Optometry Act, 1931;"

The said statement and charge by the said Gordon Waldron charge the said Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick with a contravention of Section 49 of The Legislative Assembly Act;

The said statement and charge being, unless substantiated, a contravention of Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act on the part of the said Gordon Waldron the matter is referred for investigation by the said Select Committee and for the said purpose the said Committee shall have full power and authority to call for persons, papers, and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth hereby command and compel the attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and

things as the said Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings or deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants,

begs leave to report as follows:—

1. The Select Committee has conducted an enquiry as directed on motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale), and hereto attached is a copy of the proceedings including evidence and exhibits.

2. The Select Committee finds:—

(a) That during proceedings before the Optometry Board sitting and functioning under The Optometry Act, whereat certain persons were charged with a breach of the said Act and whereat the said Gordon Waldron, K.C., was Counsel for the Board, and the said Member for St. Patrick was Counsel defending five persons charged with infractions of the said Act, the said Gordon Waldron made the following statement, to wit:—

“If you ask me seriously to state my serious conviction I would say that I think he is being paid to promote that Bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country and exposes himself to, I think, criminal prosecution,”

and that the said Gordon Waldron, K.C., upon examination before the Select Committee admitted that he made such a statement referring to the said Member for St. Patrick but claimed that the statement was made by him in Court and that upon the occasion of making it he was privileged.

(b) The law officers of the Crown advise that there was no right of privilege in making such statement so far as Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act is concerned, and that the said Gordon Waldron, K.C., was not, as he claims, privileged.

(c) That the Member for St. Patrick (E. J. Murphy) is a well-known Barrister, specializing in criminal law, and was formerly Assistant Crown Attorney for the City of Toronto and County of York

(d) That he was retained by Mr. Hamilton Cassels to act as Counsel for certain defendants charged before the Optometry Board with having committed a breach or breaches of The Optometry Act for an agreed fee of \$200.00.

(e) That the Member for St. Patrick was wholly within his rights in accepting a fee or retainer and agreeing to defend the said persons charged, which he accordingly did on the 7th, 8th and 9th of March, 1933, and that in so doing he committed no breach of The Legislative Assembly Act.

(f) That there is no evidence of the payment of any fee for the promotion of the said Bill and Mr. Waldron admitted before the Committee that, outside of the said fee of \$200.00, he had no evidence to submit that the said Member for the Riding of St. Patrick was paid to promote the Bill.

(g) That Mr. Murphy was retained by Hamilton Cassels, on the 25th of February, 1933, that notice of the introduction of the Bill, being an Act to repeal The Optometry Act, 1931, was given on February 27th, 1933 (see Votes and Proceedings, No. 7), the Bill in question was introduced on the 6th of March but if passed was not to take effect until the first of January, 1934, and that the trial of the defendants for the offences complained of against The Optometry Act commenced on March 7th, 1933.

(h) Finally, that the statement or charge by Mr. Gordon Waldron, K.C., herein before set out has not been substantiated and that it constitutes an insult upon the Member for St. Patrick under Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

April 11th, 1933.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 154), An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 157), The Municipal Amendment Act, 1933.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 158), The Assessment Amendment Act, 1933.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 159), The Local Improvement Amendment Act, 1933.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 161), An Act respecting Unemployment Relief.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Mr. Finlayson, from the Select Committee appointed to consider An Act respecting the Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly, presented their Report which was read as follows and adopted:—

To the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario:

The Select Committee which was appointed to consider Bill (No. 125), An Act respecting the Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly, has studied the readjustment of the representation in the various sections of the Province. Several meetings have been held, and representations heard. After careful survey, Your Committee begs leave to report that it has arrived at a

unanimous finding, and submits herewith a schedule of ninety Electoral Districts, recommending that the same be adopted and set out in the Schedule of Bill (No. 125).

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Department of Lands and Forests, Ontario, for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 3.*)

Also, Report of the Prison and Reformatories of the Province of Ontario for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 18.*)

Also, Report of the Department of Education, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 11.*)

The House then adjourned at 12.20 a.m.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That when this House adjourns the present sitting, it do stand adjourned until eleven of the clock in the forenoon of Thursday, April 13th.

The following Bills were read the third time and were passed:—

Bill (No. 129), An Act respecting Insurance.

Bill (No. 134), An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill (No. 143), An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill (No. 144), An Act to amend The Mercantile Law Amendment Act.

Bill (No. 135), An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act.

Bill (No. 7), An Act respecting the United Farmers' Co-operative Association.

Bill (No. 13), An Act respecting the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Electric Railway Association.

Bill (No. 14), An Act respecting the Essex Border Utilities Commission.

Bill (No. 25), An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg.

Bill (No. 26), An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill (No. 27), An Act to incorporate Thousand Islands Bridge Company.

Bill (No. 34), An Act respecting the College of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 42), An Act respecting the Township of York.

Bill (No. 45), An Act respecting Hairdressers and Barbers.

Mr. Ross asked the following Question (No. 122):—

1. Has the Department of Highways issued any special licenses to truckers on behalf of the railways. 2. To whom were they issued. 3. Are the railroads co-operating in this matter of truck service. 4. Is the trucking service for the railways to be a monopoly for the firm or firms licensed.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

1. No. Hendrie & Company, Limited, and Dominion Transport Company, Limited, railway cartage agents, have the same privileges as other truck operators, viz., they may operate within the limits or within a radius of three miles of the limits of an urban municipality without licenses. 2. Answered by No. 1. 3. We believe so. 4. Department unable to state, a matter of railway administration.

Mr. Robertson asked the following Question (No. 140):—

1. How many are employed at the Moving Picture Studio at Trenton. 2. What work is being done. 3. What is the total pay sheet for 1932. 4. What is the total capital cost to the Government for the purchase of said studio and equipment, including the original purchase price and annual capital expenditure. 5. What has been the total cost to date in connection with said studio for its annual maintenance since purchase was made, including wages, salaries and expenditures.

The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer replied as follows:—

1. Four continuously; two part time. 2. Manufacture of motion pictures for distribution through schools and other educational channels in Ontario,

British Isles and U.S.A. Also, machine shop work on sound reproducing units including hearing amplifications for school-room use. During the past fiscal year sixty-five motion pictures on the resources of the Province, including Mining, Agricultural Practices, Forest, and Fish and Game Conservation were processed, of which ten were pictures with sound. 3. \$4,262.02. 4. \$90,947.08.

5.—

1923-24.....	\$9,013.18
1924-25.....	7,789.57
1925-26.....	11,239.66
1926-27.....	10,212.49
1927-28.....	2,296.00
1928-29.....	4,369.84
1929-30.....	10,068.28
1930-31.....	11,402.09
1931-32.....	10,122.26
Total.....	<u>\$76,513.37</u>

Mr. Tweed asked the following Question (No. 142):—

What amount of money has been borrowed and charged to capital account up to October 31st, 1932, for construction of Highways.

The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer replied as follows:—

Provincial loans are issued for the various purposes mentioned in The Loan Acts, and are not earmarked for specific purposes. There has been expended on Capital Account to October 31st, 1932, the following:

Highways.....	\$167,254,966.94
Northern Ontario Roads.....	54,368,722.39
	<u>\$221,623,689.33</u>

There has been received on Capital Account to October 31st, 1932, by way of repayments by Counties, Cities and Towns, Federal Subsidy, etc., the following:

Highways.....	\$ 33,224,273.58
Northern Ontario Roads.....	6,037,342.24
	<u>\$ 39,261,615.82</u>

The net expenditure on Capital Account to October 31st, 1932, is:

Highways.....	\$134,030,693.36
Northern Ontario Roads.....	48,331,380.15
	<u>\$182,362,073.51</u>

Mr. Tweed asked the following Question No. 143:—

1. What amount has been set aside for Highway Debt Retirement since the inauguration of the debt retirement scheme.

The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer replied as follows:

1. The debt retirement scheme covers the Provincial Debt as a whole, providing for retirement in a flat period of forty years, regardless of the nature of the Capital Assets created. The annual retirement provision out of Revenue is not earmarked to specific classes of Capital expenditures.

Mr. Hutchinson asked the following Question (No. 144):—

1. Who is Superintendent of Child Welfare, Kenora District. 2. When was he appointed. 3. What is his salary. 4. What was the amount of his expenses from date of his appointment to end of fiscal year. 5. What are expenses paid since that time.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Welfare replied as follows:—

1. Mr. W. S. Carruthers is Local Superintendent of the Children's Aid Society and Local Officer under The Children of Unmarried Parents Act for the District of Kenora. 2. February 2nd, 1932. 3. He receives \$1,000.00 a year from the Province of Ontario, in return for services rendered in connection with neglected children from unorganized territory in the district and work under The Children of Unmarried Parents Act. We have no knowledge of the amount of salary paid him by the local Society. 4. \$144.80. These were expenses incurred in connection with visits made at the request of the Children's Aid Branch of the Department of Public Welfare. 5. \$31.35 for services as outlined in Question 4.

Mr. Nixon asked the following Question (No. 145):—

1. Has the Government, or the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, or its agent, the Montreal Trust Company, any information concerning the ownership of the balance of the Ontario Power Service Corporation bonds not yet turned in for exchange, or can such information be secured. 2. Who are the owners of any of the bonds of Ontario Power Service who still hold them, whose names do

not appear on lists supplied this House by the Montreal Trust Company. What is the amount each holds and the date purchased.

The Honourable the Prime Minister replied as follows:—

1. and 2. Of the total issue of \$20,000,000 of bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation Limited, \$1,687,000 were registered bonds registered under the provisions of the trust deed and the balance of \$18,313,000 were bearer bonds. Attached hereto is a letter and list furnished by the Montreal Trust Company giving the names of the holders of registered bonds who have not yet turned in their bonds for exchange and their respective addresses and the amounts held by them respectively. Neither the Government nor the Hydro-Electric Power Commission nor the Montreal Trust Company has any further information regarding bonds not yet turned in for exchange and as, apart from the registered bonds above mentioned, the bonds are bearer bonds, no information can be secured regarding the ownership thereof nor the dates upon which the same were purchased by the holders thereof. As and when these bearer bonds are exchanged for Hydro bonds by the holders thereof or through the Montreal Trust Company, the information can be given to the public.

(COPY)

MONTREAL TRUST COMPANY

61 Yonge Street,
Toronto, 10th April, 1933.

Honourable J. R. Cooke, Chairman,
The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario,
190 University Avenue, Toronto 2, Ontario.

DEAR SIR:—

In answer to your enquiry, we beg to state that as of March 25th, 1933, there appear to be Bondholders who have registered their bonds amounting in the aggregate to \$15,500.00 who have not turned in their bonds for exchange. In the enclosed list we give the names of and addresses of these Bondholders.

Of the total issue of Twenty Million Dollars of Bonds—\$1,687,000 were registered, the balance of \$18,313,000 were bearer bonds. We are not aware of the names of any of the holders of bearer bonds who still hold them, and in view of the fact that these bonds are bearer bonds, we do not know of any way in which we could ascertain the names of the holders.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) J. F. HOBKIRK,
Manager.

HOLDERS OF ONTARIO POWER SERVICE CORPORATION LIMITED BONDS REGISTERED AS TO PRINCIPAL AND FULLY REGISTERED AT MONTREAL TRUST COMPANY, TORONTO AND MONTREAL, WHO HAVE NOT YET DEPOSITED THEIR BONDS UNDER THE OFFER OF THE HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER COMMISSION OF ONTARIO:

AS OF MARCH 25TH, 1933

Name	Address	Amount
Robert John Baldock and Mrs. Elizabeth Baldock.....	Suite 3, 601 Bute St., Vancouver B.C.....	\$1,000.00
Miss Helen T. Smith.....	197 Dunn Ave., Toronto, Ont....	2,000.00
John Wise Jowett (fully registered).....	Bayfield, Ont.....	4,000.00
John R. Bates.....	Shelburne, Ont.....	1,000.00
Mrs. Caroline Cooke.....	Bolton, Ont.....	1,000.00
David S. Cooke.....	Bolton, Ont.....	2,000.00
Miss Mary Cooke.....	Bolton, Ont.....	2,500.00
Wellington B. Copeland.....	18 Lindsay Ave., Toronto, Ont...	1,000.00
Walter B. Donkin and Mrs. Charlotte F. Donkin.....	8 Chestnut Ave., Brantford, Ont..	1,000.00
		<hr/>
		\$15,500.00

Toronto, April 10th, 1933.

Certified Correct,

MONTREAL TRUST COMPANY,

Per: (Sgd.) G. F. HARKNESS,

Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Ross asked the following Question (No. 147):—

1. Did the Department of Public Works or the Department of Northern Development (Road and Bridges) build the bridge known locally as Mud Lake Bridge, Addington County. 2. Was W. W. Pringle, Paymaster, or had he any official duties, on this work. What is his age. 3. Of what Department is he an official and against what Department fund did he check in this instance. 4. Did W. W. Pringle on December 6th, 1932, issue Cheque No. 332 to one, William Newton, Arden, Ontario, for \$125.00. 5. What work had William Newton performed for the Province for which he was paid this money. 6. Was W. G. Pringle employed in any capacity by the Department or by W. W. Pringle in connection with work on Mud Lake Bridge. What relation is W. G. Pringle to W. W. Pringle. 7. Were any materials from the bridge used at W. G. Pringle's barn. If so, what was the agreement or arrangement under which they were used.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works and Labour replied as follows:—

1. The Department of Public Works built Mud Lake Bridge, Addington County. 2. Mr. W. W. Pringle was Supervising Foreman in charge of the work. His age is eighty years. 3. Department of Public Works. Municipal Bridges, grants and construction. 4. Yes. 5. No work. The money was paid to Mr. William Newton on order of Mr. W. G. Pringle out of moneys due Mr. W. G. Pringle as foreman at Mud Lake Bridge. 6. Yes. Mr. W. G. Pringle is the son of Mr. W. W. Pringle. 7. No.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee to consider a certain proposed Resolution respecting the Raising by Way of Loan a Sum of Money not exceeding the Sum of Forty Million Dollars (\$40,000,000.00) for the Public Service.

On motion by Mr. Henry (York East),

Ordered, That the amount of the loan to be authorized be reduced from \$40,000,000.00 to \$30,000,000.00.

Mr. Henry (York East) acquainted the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed Resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

The House then resolved itself into the Committee.

(In the Committee)

Resolved 1, That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council be authorized to raise by way of loan a sum of money not exceeding Thirty Million Dollars (\$30,000,000) for all or any of the purposes following, that is to say: For the Public Service, for works carried on by Commissioners on behalf of Ontario, for the covering of any debt of Ontario on open account, for paying any floating indebtedness of Ontario and for the carrying on of the Public Works authorized by the Legislature.

Resolved 2, That the aforesaid sum of money may be borrowed for any term or terms not exceeding forty years, at such rate as may be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and shall be raised upon the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Ontario and shall be chargeable thereupon.

Resolved 3, That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may provide for a special sinking fund with respect to the issue herein authorized, and such sinking fund may be at a greater rate than the one-half of one per centum specified in Subsection 2 of Section 3 of The Provincial Loans Act.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, that the Committee had come to a certain Resolution.

Ordered, That the Report be now received.

Resolved 1, That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council be authorized to raise by way of loan a sum of money not exceeding Thirty Million Dollars (\$30,000,000) for all or any of the purposes following, that is to say: For the Public Service, for works carried on by Commissioners on behalf of Ontario, for the covering of any debt of Ontario on open account, for paying any floating indebtedness of Ontario and for the carrying on of the Public Works authorized by the Legislature.

Resolved 2, That the aforesaid sum of money may be borrowed for any term or terms not exceeding forty years, at such rate as may be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and shall be raised upon the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Ontario and shall be chargeable thereupon.

Resolved 3, That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may provide for a special sinking fund with respect to the issue herein authorized, and such sinking fund may be at a greater rate than the one-half of one per centum specified in Subsection 2 of Section 3 of The Provincial Loans Act.

Resolved, "That Section 9 of The Succession Duty Act be replaced by a new Section 9, setting forth the manner in which the Succession Duty Tax shall be assessed against estates coming within the provisions of the Act, and

"That an additional duty by way of surtax of ten per centum on all duties imposed under The Succession Duty Act be levied and added to and collected with such duties."

The Resolution, having been read the second time, was agreed to, and referred to the House on Bill (No. 160).

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 163), An Act to amend The Election Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 162), An Act to amend The Voters' Lists Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 23), An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 133), An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Bill (No. 160), An Act for Raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 99), An Act to amend The Innkeepers' Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 54), An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 61), An Act to Conserve and Improve the Valley of the Don River, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 113), An Act to amend The Cemetery Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 63), An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 130), An Act to amend The Woodman's Lien for Wages Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 128), An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 136), An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 140), An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 141), An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 142), An Act to amend The Civil Service Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 145), The Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 148), An Act to amend The Companies Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 149), An Act to amend The Wolf Bounty Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 119), An Act to amend The Act of Incorporation of the Town of Kapuskasing, 11 George V, 1921, Chapter 36, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 150), The Public Vehicle Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 151), The Public Commercial Vehicle Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 138), An Act to amend The Veterinary Science Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 139), An Act respecting the Sale and Inspection of Fruit, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 152), The Manitoulin Rural Power District Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 153), The Power Commission Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 154), An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 157), The Municipal Amendment Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 158), The Assessment Amendment Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 159), The Local Improvement Amendment Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 161), An Act respecting Unemployment Relief, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-morrow.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 125), An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mahony reported, That the Committee had directed him to report progress, and to ask for leave to sit again.

Resolved, That the Committee have leave to sit again To-morrow.

The House, according to Order, again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That there be granted to His Majesty, for the services of 1934, the following sums:—

1. To defray the expenses of the Lieutenant-Governor's Office..	\$7,200 00
2. To defray the expenses of the Speaker's Office.....	298,725 00
3. To defray the expenses of the Law Clerk's Office.....	12,080 00
4. To defray the expenses of the Clerk of the Crown-in-Chancery's Office.....	3,500 00
5. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Prime Minister's Department.....	29,685 00
6. To defray the expenses of the Executive Council Office.....	10,525 00
7. To defray the expenses of the Tourist and Publicity Bureau...	43,800 00
8. To defray the expenses of the Civil Service Commissioner's Office.....	15,602 00
9. To defray the expenses of the King's Printer Office.....	37,225 00
10. To defray the expenses of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario.....	1,335,000 00
11. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Attorney-General's Department.....	92,250 00
12. To defray the expenses of the Supreme Court of Ontario.....	107,580 00
13. To defray the expenses of the Judges of Surrogate.....	1,600 00
14. To defray the expenses of the Deputy Clerks of the Crown and Local Registrars.....	25,050 00
15. To defray the expenses of the Shorthand Reporters.....	31,000 00
16. To defray the expenses of the Toronto and York Crown Attorney's Office.....	27,525 00
17. To defray the expenses of the Land Titles Office.....	32,630 00
18. To defray the expenses of the Local Master of Titles Office...	30,300 00
19. To defray the expenses of the Drainage Trials Office.....	4,550 00
20. To defray the expenses of the Audit of Criminal Justice Accounts Branch.....	803,230 00
21. To defray the expenses of the Public Trustee's Office.....	57,800 00
22. To defray the expenses of the Fire Marshal's Office.....	75,300 00
23. To defray the expenses of the Inspection of Legal Offices....	31,500 00
24. To defray the expenses of the Law Enforcement Branch (Provincial Police).....	888,955 00
25. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Securities Commission	40,460 00
26. To defray the expenses of the Workmen's Compensation Board	100,000 00
27. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Insurance Department.....	66,300 00

28. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Education Department.....	\$ 90,275 00
29. To defray the expenses of the Legislative Library.....	18,575 00
30. To defray the expenses of the Public and Separate School Education.....	3,784,305 00
31. To defray the expenses of the Inspection of Schools.....	564,300 00
32. To defray the expenses of the Departmental Examinations...	296,075 00
33. To defray the expenses of the Text-books.....	58,900 00
34. To defray the expenses of the Training Schools.....	119,600 00
35. To defray the expenses of the Toronto Normal and Model Schools.....	125,475 00
36. To defray the expenses of the Ottawa Normal and Model Schools.....	81,360 00
37. To defray the expenses of the London Normal School.....	40,800 00
38. To defray the expenses of the Hamilton Normal School.....	38,515 00
39. To defray the expenses of the Peterborough Normal School...	38,260 00
40. To defray the expenses of the Stratford Normal School.....	42,200 00
41. To defray the expenses of the North Bay Normal School....	38,815 00
42. To defray the expenses of the University of Ottawa Normal School.....	112,475 00
43. To defray the expenses of the Sturgeon Falls Model School...	41,500 00
44. To defray the expenses of the Sandwich Model School.....	13,575 00
45. To defray the expenses of the Emburun Model School.....	37,175 00
46. To defray the expenses of the High Schools and Collegiate Institute.....	425,425 00
47. To defray the expenses of the Departmental Museum.....	4,400 00
48. To defray the expenses of the Public Library.....	94,900 00
49. To defray the expenses of the Vocational Education.....	1,517,325 00
50. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Training College of Technical Teachers.....	20,050 00
51. To defray the expenses of the Superannuated Teachers.....	20,300 00
52. To defray the expenses of the Provincial and other Universities	1,800,500 00
53. To defray the expenses of the Belleville School for the Deaf ..	152,750 00
54. To defray the expenses of the Brantford School for the Blind	85,724 00
55. To defray the expenses of the Monteith Northern Academy..	44,655 00
56. To defray the expenses of the Main Office and Branches and General Lands and Forests Department.....	245,825 00
57. To defray the expenses of the Agents Branch, Lands and Forests Department.....	90,000 00
58. To defray the expenses of the Foresters and Scalers Branch, Lands and Forests Department.....	130,000 00
59. To defray the expenses of the Provincial Parks Branch, Lands and Forests Department.....	65,050 00
60. To defray the expenses of the Forestry Branch, Lands and Forests Department.....	896,325 00
61. To defray the expenses of the Surveys Branch, Lands and Forests Department.....	86,425 00
62. To defray the expenses of the Colonization Roads Branch, Northern Development Department.....	471,025 00
70. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, General and Branches, Game and Fisheries Department.....	530,400 00

71. To defray the expenses of the Wolf Bounty, Game and Fisheries Department.....	\$ 60,000 00
72. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Public Works Department.....	89,750 00
73. To defray the expenses of the General Superintendence, Public Works Department.....	31,450 00
74. To defray the expenses of the Government House.....	33,500 00
75. To defray the expenses of the Parliament and Departmental Buildings.....	382,326 00
76. To defray the expenses of the Osgoode Hall.....	39,365 00
77. To defray the expenses of the Educational Buildings.....	11,250 00
78. To defray the expenses of the Agricultural Buildings.....	6,650 00
79. To defray the expenses of the Welfare Buildings.....	950 00
80. To defray the expenses of the District Buildings.....	11,320 00
81. To defray the expenses of the General Buildings.....	4,000 00
82. To defray the expenses of the Public Works and Bridges.....	70,050 00
83. To defray the expenses of the Public Buildings.....	190,500 00
84. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Highways Department.....	319,975 00
85. To defray the expenses of the Motor Vehicles Branch, Highways Department.....	212,700 00
86. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Department of Health.....	128,700 00
87. To defray the expenses of the District Officers of Health, Department of Health.....	43,200 00
88. To defray the expenses of the Maternal and Child Hygiene and Public Health Nursing, Health Department.....	86,425 00
89. To defray the expenses of the Dental Service, Health Department.....	24,100 00
90. To defray the expenses of the Inspection of Training Schools for Nurses Branch, Health Department.....	12,275 00
91. To defray the expenses of the Preventable Diseases Branch, Health Department.....	295,250 00
92. To defray the expenses of the Industrial Hygiene Branch, Health Department.....	53,300 00
93. To defray the expenses of the Sanitary Engineering Branch, Health Department.....	47,125 00
94. To defray the expenses of the Laboratory Branch, Health Department.....	111,250 00
95. To defray the expenses of the Laboratory Divisions, Health Department.....	50,900 00
96. To defray the expenses of the Public Health Education Branch	28,625 00

The House having continued to sit until after midnight,

Thursday, April 13th, 1933.

97. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Grants and General Expenses.....	\$2,066,700 00
98. To defray the expenses of the Brockville Hospital.....	390,700 00
99. To defray the expenses of the Cobourg Hospital.....	142,700 00
100. To defray the expenses of the Hamilton Hospital.....	473,875 00
101. To defray the expenses of the Kingston Hospital.....	395,375 00

102. To defray the expenses of the London Hospital.....	\$ 503,700 00
103. To defray the expenses of the Mimico Hospital.....	391,400 00
104. To defray the expenses of the Orillia Hospital.....	543,550 00
105. To defray the expenses of the Penetanguishene Hospital.....	211,400 00
106. To defray the expenses of the Toronto Hospital.....	339,725 00
107. To defray the expenses of the Whitby Hospital.....	567,350 00
108. To defray the expenses of the Woodstock Hospital.....	207,000 00
109. To defray the expenses of the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital.....	134,845 00
63. To defray the expenses of the Main Office and Branches and General, Department of Mines.....	230,925 00
64. To defray the expenses of the Gas and Well Inspectors' Branch, Department of Mines.....	8,500 00
65. To defray the expenses of the Office of Fuel Controller, Department of Mines.....	500 00
66. To defray the expenses of the Sulphur Fumes Arbitrator, Department of Mines.....	5,000 00
67. To defray the expenses of the Temiskaming Testing Laboratories, Department of Mines.....	17,000 00
68. To defray the expenses of the Offices of Mining Recorder, Department of Mines.....	43,500 00
69. To defray the expenses of the Draughtsman, North Bay, Mines Department.....	6,500 00
110. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Department of Labour.....	38,096 50
111. To defray the expenses of the Apprenticeship Board, Labour Department.....	26,575 00
112. To defray the expenses of the Boiler Inspection Branch, Labour Department.....	25,550 00
113. To defray the expenses of the Factory Inspection Branch, Labour Department.....	72,900 00
114. To defray the expenses of the Board of Examiners of Operating Engineers, Labour Department.....	27,275 00
115. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Government Employment Offices, Labour Department.....	212,000 00
116. To defray the expenses of the Minimum Wage Board, Labour Department.....	15,200 00
117. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Grants, Refuges, Orphanages and Charities.....	331,300 00
118. To defray the expenses of the Children's Aid Branch.....	130,018 00
119. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Training School for Boys.....	94,275 00
120. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Training School for Girls.....	26,850 00
121. To defray the expenses of the Mothers' Allowance Commission	1,825,575 00
122. To defray the expenses of the Old Age Pensions Commission.	2,817,600 00
123. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Provincial Treasurer's Department.....	130,800 00
124. To defray the expenses of the Budget Committee's Office....	5,800 00
125. To defray the expenses of the Office of the Controller of Revenue.....	218,550 00
126. To defray the expenses of the Board of Censors.....	24,215 00
127. To defray the expenses of the Motion Picture Bureau.....	75,000 00

128. To defray the expenses of the Public Records and Archives..	\$ 20,950 00
129. To defray the expenses of the Post Office.....	120,900 00
130. To defray the expenses of the Provincial Auditor's Office....	104,925 00
131. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Provincial Secretary's Department.....	64,805 00
132. To defray the expenses of the Registrar-General.....	57,975 00
133. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Reformatories and Prisons Branch.....	79,750 00
134. To defray the expenses of the Board of Parole.....	22,975 00
135. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Reformatory, Guelph.	323,005 00
136. To defray the expenses of the Mimico Reformatory, Mimico.	103,025 00
137. To defray the expenses of the Mercer Reformatory, Toronto.	94,125 00
138. To defray the expenses of the Burwash Industrial Farm.....	322,325 00
139. To defray the expenses of the Fort William Industrial Farm.	41,350 00
140. To defray the expenses of the Main Office, Agriculture Department.....	273,532 50
141. To defray the expenses of the Statistics and Publications Branch.....	13,800 00
142. To defray the expenses of the Agricultural and Horticultural Societies Branch.....	110,750 00
143. To defray the expenses of the Live Stock Branch.....	96,725 00
144. To defray the expenses of the Institutes Branch.....	68,975 00
145. To defray the expenses of the Dairy Branch.....	170,175 00
146. To defray the expenses of the Fruit Branch.....	87,950 00
147. To defray the expenses of the Agricultural Representatives..	316,250 00
148. To defray the expenses of the Crops, Co-operation and Markets.....	36,950 00
149. To defray the expenses of the Colonization and Immigration.	5,900 00
150. To defray the expenses of the Kemptville Agricultural School	63,000 00
151. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Veterinary College, Guelph.....	50,820 00
152. To defray the expenses of the Western Ontario Experimental Farm, Ridgetown.....	18,050 00
153. To defray the expenses of the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.....	730,972 00
154. To defray the expenses of the Miscellaneous.....	200,000 00

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had come to several Resolutions.

Ordered, That the Report be received To-morrow.

The Provincial Secretary presented to the House, by command of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor:—

Report of the Department of Public Welfare, Province of Ontario, for year 1931-32. (*Sessional Papers No. 19.*)

Also, Report relating to Registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths, Ontario, for year ending December 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 13.*)

Also, Report of the Niagara Parks Commission, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 52.*)

Also, Report of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for year ending October 31st, 1932. (*Sessional Papers No. 26.*)

The House then adjourned at 1.00 a.m.

THURSDAY, APRIL 13TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Jamieson presented the Report of Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization which was read as follows and adopted:—Your Committee begs to report that sittings have been held on March 1st and April 11th.

At the first meeting Mr. Jamieson was elected Chairman. Honourable Mr. Kennedy suggested that last year's plan of investigating under subcommittees be continued and the following were named, with their Chairmen, respectively: Fruits and Vegetables, Mr. Bragg; Field Crops, Mr. Hill; Live Stock, Mr. Fraleigh; Dairy Products and Egg Grading, Mr. Sanderson; and Colonization, Honourable Dr. Poisson.

These subcommittees have held several meetings and reports of their findings have been forwarded to the Minister.

At the first meeting the Committee heard representatives of the Ontario Brotherhood of Threshingmen, who sought a change in the law respecting liens on threshed crops. After a full discussion, it was decided to take no action.

In its second and final meeting the Committee heard addresses by D. A. Campbell, live stock shipping agent, of Montreal, on "Export Costs"; by J. M. McCallum, Chief of Stock Yard Service, Federal Live Stock Branch, on "Export Cattle"; and by F. C. Fletcher, General Manager of the Union Stock Yards, Toronto, on "Stock Yards' Service."

Representation was made by H. L. Craise, W. W. Robinson, C. I. Delworth and E. J. Atkins of the Ontario Growers Markets Council seeking financial aid

to carry on the Council's work until compulsory registration could be effected. Your Committee decided to leave the question with the Minister.

On motion of Mr. Fraleigh your Committee decided to ask the Honourable the Prime Minister to consider the advisability of selecting men from the ranks of the unemployed to work on farms for their board and lodging, with a minimum wage to be paid by the Government. A second resolution by Mr. Fraleigh was approved, which asked Honourable Mr. Kennedy to urge the Federal Minister of Agriculture to continue his investigations regarding the marketing of live stock.

Mr. McLean, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Fish and Game, presented their Report, which was read and adopted as follows:—The Standing Committee on Fish and Game begs leave to present to the House the minutes of their meetings during the current Session and recommend that they be printed as an appendix to the Journals of the House.

Mr. Hipel asked the following Question (No. 89):—

1. How many Government cars are reserved for the use of the Ministers.
2. How many chauffeurs are engaged to drive Ministers' cars. 3. What were their wages and expenses for each of the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive. 4. What was the total cost of each of these Minister's cars, including chauffeurs' wages and expenses, in the years 1929 to 1932, inclusive.

The Honourable the Minister of Highways replied as follows:—

1. Eleven. (N.B.: These cars are not exclusively reserved for the use of Ministers, but are used in general Government service of the respective Departments.) 2. Eleven.

	1929	1930	1931	1932
3.—	\$16,379.15	\$16,404.94	\$19,418.10	\$19,147.64
4.—				
Prime Minister.....	\$3,087.40	\$2,759.30	\$2,465.54	\$3,145.76
Treasury.....	3,101.63	2,988.33	1,982.15	2,844.84
Health.....	3,543.96	3,077.95	2,370.06	2,944.68
Provincial Secretary.....	3,491.62	3,193.57	3,536.23	3,308.06
Highways.....	3,228.97	2,744.95	1,575.69	3,715.31
Agriculture.....	3,688.07	3,294.87	2,728.89	3,211.03
Mines.....	2,995.70	3,143.03	2,526.65	3,085.28
Attorney-General.....	2,886.83	2,901.54	3,101.57	3,476.39
Lands and Forests.....	4,170.61	3,968.78	3,634.27	4,329.70
Welfare.....	3,989.67	3,490.29
Works.....	290.30	2,913.19	3,226.75

Mr. Blakelock asked the following Question (No. 149):—

1. Were tenders called for the plastering of the East Wing of the Parliament Buildings. 2. If so, how many tenders were received. 3. What were the amounts of the tenders in each case. 4. What was the actual cost of plastering the new wing by the method adopted.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Works replied as follows:—

1. Yes. 2. Answered by No. 3. 3. (1) Watkins Bros., \$41,904.00; (2) W. J. Hynes, Limited, \$47,559.00; (3) Jackson Lewis Company, Limited, \$48,000.00; (4) E. A. Murby, \$54,000.00; (5) Building Repairs and Alterations, Limited, \$59,590.00; (6) Andrew Petrie and Company, \$61,200.00; (7) James Michael, \$78,998.00. Because of additional partitions the final quantities of plastering exceeded the quantities as tendered above. 4. \$89,977.72.

On motion of Mr. Medd, seconded by Mr. Ross,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing: 1. From what firms or individuals in Scotland did the Ontario Liquor Control Board buy whiskey or other supplies during the last fiscal year. 2. What was the amount and value of the business done with each firm or individual. 3. Who was the Ontario representative in each instance and what commissions did each Canadian representative receive. 4. (a) What were the gross sales from the following liquor stores during the last fiscal year: Woodstock, Brantford, Paris. (b) What was the total cost of local administration in each instance.

On motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bragg,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return showing: 1. What fees or remunerations were paid in connection with the sale of law stamps during the years 1930 and 1931, giving names and addresses and occupations of recipients, and amounts paid to each recipient. 2. What services do such persons render to entitle them to such fees or remuneration.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 147), The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1933, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 163), An Act to amend The Election Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr.

Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 162), An Act to amend The Voters' Lists Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 160), An Act for Raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 133), An Act to amend The Power Commission Act, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 137), An Act respecting the Acquisition of the Properties of the Ontario Power Service Corporation, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

Mr. Black, from the Committee of Supply, reported the following Resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven thousand, two hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of the Lieutenant-Governor's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

2. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and ninety-eight thousand, seven hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of the Speaker's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

3. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twelve thousand and eighty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Law Clerk's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

4. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three thousand, five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Clerk of the Crown-in-Chancery's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

5. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-nine thousand, six hundred and eighty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Prime Minister's Department, for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

6. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ten thousand, five hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Executive Council Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

7. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-three thousand, eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Tourist and Publicity Bureau for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

8. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifteen thousand, six hundred and two dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Civil Service Commissioner's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

9. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-seven thousand, two hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of King's Printer Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

10. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million, three hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

11. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ninety-five thousand, two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Attorney-General's Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

12. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and seven thousand, five hundred and eighty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Supreme Court of Ontario for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

13. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One thousand, six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Judges of Surrogate for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
14. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-five thousand and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Deputy Clerks of the Crown and Local Registrars for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
15. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-one thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Shorthand Reporters for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
16. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-seven thousand, five hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Toronto and York Crown Attorney's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
17. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-two thousand, six hundred and thirty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Land Titles Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
18. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty thousand and three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Local Masters of Titles Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
19. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand, five hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Drainage Trials Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
20. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eight hundred and three thousand, two hundred and thirty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Audit of Criminal Justice Accounts Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
21. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty-seven thousand, eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Trustee's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
22. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy-five thousand, three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Fire Marshal's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
23. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-one thousand, five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Inspection of Legal Offices for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
24. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eight hundred and eighty-eight thousand, nine hundred and fifty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Law Enforcement Branch (Provincial Police) for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

25. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty thousand, four hundred and sixty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Securities Commission for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

26. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Workmen's Compensation Board for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

27. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty-six thousand, three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Insurance Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

28. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ninety thousand, two hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Education Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

29. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighteen thousand, five hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Legislative Library for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

30. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three million, seven hundred and eighty-four thousand, three hundred and five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public and Separate School Education for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

31. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred and sixty-four thousand, three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Inspection of Schools for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

32. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and ninety-six thousand and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Departmental Examinations for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

33. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty-eight thousand, nine hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Text-books for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

34. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and nineteen thousand, six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Training Schools for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

35. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and twenty-five thousand, four hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Toronto Normal and Model Schools for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

36. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-one thousand, three hundred and sixty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ottawa Normal and Model Schools for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

37. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty thousand, eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of London Normal School for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

38. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-eight thousand, five hundred and fifteen dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Hamilton Normal School for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

39. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-eight thousand, two hundred and sixty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Peterborough Normal School for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

40. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-two thousand, two hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Stratford Normal School for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

41. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-eight thousand, eight hundred and fifteen dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of North Bay Normal School for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

42. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and twelve thousand, four hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of University of Ottawa Normal School for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

43. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-one thousand, five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Sturgeon Falls Model School for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

44. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirteen thousand, five hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Sandwich Model School for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

45. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-seven thousand, one hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Embrun Model School for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

46. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four hundred and twenty-five thousand, four hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of High Schools and Collegiate Institutes for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

47. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand, four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Departmental Museum for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

48. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ninety-four thousand, nine hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Libraries for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

49. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million, five hundred and seventeen thousand, three hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Vocational Education for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

50. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty thousand and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Training College of Technical Teachers for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

51. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty thousand, three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Superannuated Teachers for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

52. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million, eight hundred thousand, five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial and other Universities for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

53. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and fifty-two thousand, seven hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Belleville School for the Deaf for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

54. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-five thousand, seven hundred and twenty-four dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Brantford School for the Blind for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

55. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-four thousand, six hundred and fifty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Monteith Northern Academy for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

56. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and forty-five thousand, eight hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office and Branches and General, Lands and Forests Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

57. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ninety thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Agents Branch, Lands and Forests Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

58. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and thirty thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Foresters and Scalers Branch, Lands and Forests Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

59. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty-five thousand and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial Parks Branch, Lands and Forests Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

60. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eight hundred and ninety-six thousand, three hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Forestry Branch, Lands and Forests Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

61. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-six thousand, four hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Surveys Branch, Lands and Forests Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

62. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four hundred and seventy-one

thousand, and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Colonization Roads Branch, Northern Development Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

63. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and thirty thousand nine hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office and Branches and General, Department of Mines for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

64. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eight thousand, five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Gas and Well Inspectors' Branch, Department of Mines for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

65. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Office of Fuel Controller, Department of Mines for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

66. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Sulphur Fumes Arbitrator, Department of Mines for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

67. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventeen thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Temiskaming Testing Laboratories, Department of Mines for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

68. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-three thousand, five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Office of Mining Recorder, Department of Mines for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

69. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Six thousand, five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Office of Draughtsman, North Bay, Mines Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

70. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred and thirty thousand, four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, General and Branches, Game and Fisheries Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

71. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Wolf Bounty, Game and Fisheries Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

72. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-nine thousand, seven hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Public Works Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

73. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-one thousand, four hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of General Superintendence, Public Works Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

74. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-three thousand, five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Government House for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

75. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and eighty-two thousand, three hundred and twenty-six dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Parliament and Departmental Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

76. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-nine thousand, three hundred and sixty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Osgoode Hall for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

77. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eleven thousand, two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Educational Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

78. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Six thousand, six hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Agricultural Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

79. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Nine hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Welfare Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

80. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eleven thousand, three hundred and twenty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

81. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of General Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

82. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy thousand and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Works and Bridges for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

83. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and ninety thousand, five hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Buildings for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

84. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and nineteen thousand, nine hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Highways Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

85. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and twelve thousand, seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Motor Vehicles Branch, Highways Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

86. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and twenty-eight thousand, seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Department of Health for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

87. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-three thousand, two hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of District Officers of Health, Department of Health for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

88. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-six thousand, four hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Maternal and Child Hygiene and Public Health Nursing, Health Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

89. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-four thousand, one hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Dental Service, Health Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

90. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twelve thousand, two hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Inspection of Training Schools for Nurses Branch, Health Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

91. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and ninety-five thousand, two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Preventable Diseases Branch, Health Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

92. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty-three thousand, three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Industrial Hygiene Branch, Health Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

93. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-seven thousand, one hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Sanitary Engineering Branch, Health Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

94. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and eleven thousand, two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Laboratory Branch, Health Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

95. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty thousand, nine hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Laboratory Divisions, Health Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

96. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-eight thousand, six hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Health Education Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

97. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two million and sixty-six thousand, seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Grants and General Expenses, Health Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

98. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and ninety thousand, seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Brockville Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

99. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and forty-two thousand, seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Cobourg Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

100. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Four hundred and seventy-three thousand, eight hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Hamilton Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

101. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and ninety-five thousand, three hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Kingston Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

102. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred and three thousand, seven hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of London Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

103. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and ninety-one thousand, four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Mimico Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

104. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred and forty-three thousand, five hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Orillia Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

105. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and eleven thousand, four hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Penetanguishene Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

106. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and thirty-nine thousand, seven hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Toronto Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

107. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five hundred and sixty-seven thousand, three hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Whitby Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

108. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and seven thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Woodstock Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

109. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and thirty-four thousand, eight hundred and forty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Toronto Psychiatric Hospital for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

110. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-eight thousand and ninety-six dollars and fifty cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Labour Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

111. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-six thousand, five hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Apprenticeship Board, Labour Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

112. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-five thousand, five hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Boiler Inspection Branch, Labour Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

113. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy-two thousand, nine hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Factory Inspection Branch, Labour Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

114. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-seven thousand, two hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Board of Examiners of Operating Engineers, Labour Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

115. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and twelve thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Government Employment Offices, Labour Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

116. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifteen thousand, two hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Minimum Wage Board, Labour Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

117. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and thirty-one thousand, three hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Grants—Refuges, Orphanages, and Charities for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

118. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and thirty thousand and eighteen dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Children's Aid Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

119. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ninety-four thousand, two hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Training School for Boys for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

120. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-six thousand, eight hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Training School for Girls for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

121. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One million, eight hundred and twenty-five thousand, five hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Mothers' Allowances Commission for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

122. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two million, eight hundred and seventeen thousand, six hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Old Age Pensions Commission for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

123. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and thirty thousand, eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Provincial Treasurer's Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

124. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five thousand, eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Budget Committee's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

125. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and eighteen thousand, five hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Office of the Controller of Revenue for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

126. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-four thousand, two hundred and fifteen dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Board of Censors for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

127. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy-five thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Motion Picture Bureau for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

128. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty thousand, nine hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Public Records and Archives for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

129. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and twenty thousand, nine hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Post Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

130. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and four thousand, nine hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Provincial Auditor's Office for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

131. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty-four thousand, eight hundred and five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Provincial Secretary's Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

132. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty-seven thousand, nine hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Registrar-General for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

133. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seventy-nine thousand, seven hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Reformatories and Prisons Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

134. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Twenty-two thousand, nine hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Board of Parole for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

135. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and twenty-three thousand and five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Reformatory, Guelph for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

136. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and three thousand and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Mimico Reformatory for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

137. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ninety-four thousand, one hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Mercer Reformatory, Toronto for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
138. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and twenty-two thousand, three hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Burwash Industrial Farm for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
139. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Forty-one thousand, three hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Fort William Industrial Farm for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
140. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred and seventy-three thousand, five hundred and thirty-two dollars and fifty cents be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Main Office, Agriculture Department for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
141. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirteen thousand, eight hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Statistics and Publications Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
142. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and ten thousand, seven hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Agricultural and Horticultural Societies' Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
143. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Ninety-six thousand, seven hundred and twenty-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Live Stock Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
144. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty-eight thousand, nine hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Institutes Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
145. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding One hundred and seventy thousand, one hundred and seventy-five dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Dairy Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
146. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighty-seven thousand, nine hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Fruit Branch for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
147. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Three hundred and sixteen thousand, two hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Agricultural Representatives for the year ending 31st October, 1934.
148. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Thirty-six thousand, nine hundred and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Crops, Co-operation and Markets for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

149. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Five thousand, nine hundred dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Colonization and Immigration for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

150. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Sixty-three thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Kemptville Agricultural School for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

151. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Fifty thousand, eight hundred and twenty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Veterinary College, Guelph for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

152. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Eighteen thousand and fifty dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Western Ontario Experimental Farm, Ridgetown for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

153. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Seven hundred and thirty thousand, nine hundred and seventy-two dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

154. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding Two hundred thousand dollars be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Miscellaneous for the year ending 31st October, 1934.

The said Resolutions, have been read a second time, were concurred in.

The House according to Order, resolved itself into the Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee)

Resolved, That there be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this Province a sum not exceeding Forty Million, Eighty-three Thousand, Two Hundred and Fifty-seven Dollars and Twenty-two cents (\$40,083,257.22). to meet the Supply to that extent granted to His Majesty.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had come to a Resolution.

Ordered, That the Report be received forthwith.

Mr. Black, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported a Resolution, which was read as follows:—

Resolved, That there be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this Province, a sum not exceeding Forty Million, Eighty-three Thousand, Two Hundred and Fifty-seven Dollars and Twenty-two cents (\$40,083,257.22), to meet the Supply to that extent granted to His Majesty.

The Resolution, having been read the second time, was agreed to.

The following Bill was then introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 164), intituled "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service of the Financial Year ending on the 31st day of October, 1933, and for the Public Service of the Financial Year ending the 31st day of October, 1934." *Mr. Dunlop.*

Ordered, That the Bill be read the second time forthwith.

The Bill was then read a second time.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a third time forthwith.

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 155), An Act respecting the Operation of Commercial Motor Vehicles, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of Bill (No. 156), An Act to amend The Power Commission Act, having been read,

Mr. Nixon moved,

That the Bill be now read the second time.

And the Motion, having been put, was lost on the following Division:—

YEAS

Blakelock
Bragg
Elliott
(Bruce, North)
Hipel
Hutchinson
Medd

Munro
Murray
McQuibban
Newman
Nixon
Oliver

Robertson
Ross
Sangster
Simpson
Sinclair
Slack
Tweed—19.

NAYS

Acres	Hill	Price
Aubin	Honeywell	(Parkdale)
Baird	Ireland	Raven
Bell	Jamieson	Reid
Berry	Jutten	Robb
Black	Kennedy	St. Denis
Blanchard	(Temiskaming)	Sanderson
Burt	Kenning	Scholfield
Case	Lancaster	Seguin
Challies	Laughton	Shields
Clark	Macaulay	Singer
Colliver	Martin	Skinner
Coté	(Hamilton)	Smith
Craig	Martin	(Greenwood)
Davis	(Brantford)	Staples
Dunlop	Moore	Stedman
Elliott	Murphy	Strickland
(Rainy River)	(St. Patrick)	Vaughan
Finlayson	Murphy	Waters
Freele	(Beaches)	Willson
Graves	McArthur	(Niagara Falls)
Harcourt	McCrea	Wilson
Harrison	McLean	(Windsor, East)
Henry	McNaughton	Wilson
(York, East)	Nesbitt	(Lincoln)
Henry	Poisson	Wright—66.
(Kent, East)		

And so it was declared in the Negative.

On motion of Mr. McQuibban, seconded by Mr. Sinclair,

Ordered, That there be laid before this House a Return of all agreements and contracts entered into between the Ontario Power Service Corporation, Limited, and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for the acquisition by the Commission of the assets of the Corporation and the debentures of the same, and also all correspondence in connection with the same, passing from or to (1) the Government of the Province of Ontario, (2) the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, and (3) the Ontario Power Service Corporation, Limited, and also all memorandums, reports, proposals, advertisements, papers and documents of any kind, or copies thereof, in any way relating to such acquisition or in any way relating to or connected with the preliminary negotiations leading to such negotiations commenced, in the possession or power of any of the said three above-mentioned parties or of their solicitors, agents or trustees, and also showing the names of all holders of bonds of the Ontario Power Service Corporation who deposited their bonds as a part of such acquisition of the assets of the Corporation.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 77), An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 109), An Act to amend The Public Health Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 120), An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill by incorporating therein the provisions of Bill (No. 128). An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 124), The School Law Amendment Act, 1933, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 161), An Act respecting Unemployment Relief, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 125), An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill with certain amendments.

Ordered, That the amendments be taken into consideration forthwith.

The amendments, having been read the second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee to consider Bill (No. 23), An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough, and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had directed him to report the Bill without any amendment.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of Bill (No. 147), The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1933, having been read,

Ordered, That the Order be discharged, and that the Bill be forthwith again referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee; and, after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Black reported, That the Committee had amended the Bill as directed.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-day.

The following Bills were read the third time and were passed:—

Bill (No. 55), An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Bill (No. 77), An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Bill (No. 109), An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill (No. 120), An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Bill (No. 124), The School Law Amendment Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 99), An Act to amend The Innkeeper's Act.

Bill (No. 54), An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act.

Bill (No. 61), An Act to Conserve and Improve the Valley of the Don River.

Bill (No. 113), An Act to amend The Cemetery Act.

Bill (No. 63), An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act.

Bill (No. 130), An Act to amend The Woodman's Lien for Wages Act.

Bill (No. 136), An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act.

Bill (No. 140), An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act.

Bill (No. 141), An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act.

Bill (No. 142), An Act to amend The Civil Service Act.

Bill (No. 145), The Forest Fires Prevention Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 148), An Act to amend The Companies Act.

Bill (No. 149), An Act to amend The Wolf Bounty Act.

Bill (No. 119), An Act to amend The Act of Incorporation of the Town of Kapuskasing, 11 George V, 1921, Chapter 36.

Bill (No. 150), The Public Vehicle Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 151), The Public Commercial Vehicle Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 138), An Act to amend The Veterinary Science Act.

Bill (No. 139), An Act respecting the Sale and Inspection of Fruit.

Bill (No. 152), The Manitoulin Rural Power District Act.

Bill (No. 153), The Power Commission Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 154), An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act.

Bill (No. 157), The Municipal Amendment Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 158), The Assessment Amendment Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 159), The Local Improvement Amendment Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 161), An Act respecting Unemployment Relief.

Bill (No. 125), An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly.

Bill (No. 147), The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 137), An Act respecting the Acquisition of the Properties of the Ontario Power Service Corporation.

Bill (No. 133), An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Bill (No. 160), An Act for Raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Bill (No. 163), An Act to amend The Election Act.

Bill (No. 162), An Act to amend The Voters' Lists Act.

Bill (No. 23), An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale).

Ordered, That the full Sessional Indemnity be paid to those Members absent on account of illness or other unavoidable causes.

On motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That when this House adjourns the present Sitting it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, the 18th day of April, at Three of the Clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

TUESDAY, APRIL 18TH, 1933

PRAYERS.

3 O'CLOCK P.M.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor proceeded in State to the Legislative Assembly and being seated upon the Throne,

Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour in the following words:—

May it please Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly of the Province has at its present Sittings thereof passed several Bills to which, in the name and on behalf of the said Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

The Clerk Assistant then read the titles of the Acts that had passed severally as follows:—

Bill (No. 1), An Act respecting the Mutual Relief Life Insurance Company.

Bill (No. 2), An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Bill (No. 3), An Act respecting St. Patricks Asylum, Ottawa.

Bill (No. 4), An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur.

Bill (No. 5), An Act respecting the Central Canada Exhibition Association.

Bill (No. 6), An Act respecting the Sisters of St. Joseph for the Diocese of Toronto.

Bill (No. 7), An Act respecting the United Farmers Co-operative Association.

Bill (No. 9), An Act respecting the Niagara Falls General Hospital Trust.

Bill (No. 11), An Act respecting the Town of Niagara.

Bill (No. 12), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 13), An Act respecting the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Electric Railway Association.

Bill (No. 14), An Act respecting Essex Border Utilities Commission.

Bill (No. 15), An Act respecting the Town of Sandwich.

Bill (No. 16), An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Bill (No. 17), An Act respecting the Canadian Transit Company.

Bill (No. 18), An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall.

Bill (No. 19), An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of London.

Bill (No. 20), An Act respecting the Algoma Steel Corporation, Limited.

Bill (No. 22), An Act respecting the Village of Forest Hill.

Bill (No. 23), An Act respecting the Township of Scarborough.

Bill (No. 24), An Act respecting the Township of East York.

Bill (No. 25), An Act respecting the Town of Tillsonburg.

Bill (No. 26), An Act respecting the City of London.

Bill (No. 27), An Act to incorporate Thousand Islands Bridge Company.

Bill (No. 28), An Act respecting the Town of Whitby.

Bill (No. 29), An Act respecting the Town of Kenora.

Bill (No. 30), An Act respecting Havergal College.

Bill (No. 31), An Act respecting the City of Peterborough.

Bill (No. 32), An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 33), An Act respecting Les Révérends Pères Oblats De L'Immaculée Conception de Marie.

Bill (No. 34), An Act respecting the College of Ottawa.

Bill (No. 35), An Act respecting the City of Welland.

Bill (No. 36), An Act respecting the Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa.

Bill (No. 37), An Act respecting the Township of Teck.

Bill (No. 38), An Act respecting the Toronto Harbour Commissioners.

Bill (No. 39), An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Bill (No. 40), An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Bill (No. 41), An Act respecting Amalgamation of Toronto East General Hospital and Toronto Orthopedic Hospital.

Bill (No. 42), An Act respecting the Township of York.

Bill (No. 44), An Act respecting the Town of Cornwall.

Bill (No. 45), An Act respecting Hairdressers and Barbers.

Bill (No. 46), An Act respecting the Township of Crowland.

Bill (No. 47), An Act respecting the Town of Walkerville.

Bill (No. 48), An Act respecting the Town of Kenora and the Keewatin Power Company, Limited.

Bill (No. 49), The Mortgagors and Purchasers Relief Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 52), An Act respecting Ontario Institute of Radio Therapy.

Bill (No. 53), An Act to amend The Marriage Act.

Bill (No. 54), An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act.

Bill (No. 55), An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Bill (No. 56), An Act to amend The Mechanics Lien Act.

Bill (No. 57), An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Bill (No. 58), An Act to amend The Execution Act.

Bill (No. 59), An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Bill (No. 60), An Act respecting Collection Agencies.

Bill (No. 61), An Act to Conserve and Improve the Valley of the Don River.

Bill (No. 63), An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act.

Bill (No. 69), An Act to amend The Northern Development Act.

Bill (No. 70), An Act to amend The Long Point Park Act.

Bill (No. 77), An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Bill (No. 81), An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Bill (No. 83), An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Bill (No. 84), An Act to amend The Registration of Nurses Act.

Bill (No. 86), An Act to amend The Theatres and Cinematographs Act.

Bill (No. 89), An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Bill (No. 94), An Act to amend The Old Age Pensions Act.

Bill (No. 99), An Act to amend The Innkeepers Act.

Bill (No. 100), An Act respecting Nursery Stock.

Bill (No. 102), The Northern Ontario Appropriation Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 105), An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act.

Bill (No. 106), An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

Bill (No. 107), An Act to amend The Municipal Franchises Act.

Bill (No. 109), An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill (No. 110), An Act respecting Relief Land Settlement.

Bill (No. 112), An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill (No. 113), An Act to amend The Cemetery Act.

Bill (No. 114), An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

Bill (No. 115), An Act to amend The Stenographic Reporters Act.

Bill (No. 118), An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill (No. 119), An Act to amend The Act of Incorporation of the Town of Kapuskasing, 11 George V, 1921, Cap. 6.

Bill (No. 120), An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Bill (No. 122), An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Bill (No. 123), An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act.

Bill (No. 124), The School Law Amendment Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 125), An Act respecting Representation of the People in the Legislative Assembly.

Bill (No. 126), An Act to amend The Bulk Sales Act.

Bill (No. 129), The Insurance (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 130), An Act to amend The Woodmen's Lien for Wages Act.

Bill (No. 133), An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Bill (No. 134), An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill (No. 135), An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act.

Bill (No. 136), An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act.

Bill (No. 137), An Act respecting the Acquisition of the Properties of the Ontario Power Service Corporation.

Bill (No. 138), An Act to amend The Veterinary Science Practice Act, 1931.

Bill (No. 139), An Act respecting The Sale and Inspection of Fruit.

Bill (No. 140), An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act.

Bill (No. 141), An Act to amend The Municipal Drainage Act.

Bill (No. 142), An Act to amend The Public Service Act.

Bill (No. 143), An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Bill (No. 144), An Act to amend The Mercantile Law Amendment Act.

Bill (No. 145), An Act to amend The Forest Fires Prevention Act.

Bill (No. 147), The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 148), An Act to amend The Companies Act.

Bill (No. 149), An Act to amend The Wolf Bounty Act.

Bill (No. 150), An Act to amend The Public Vehicle Act.

Bill (No. 151), An Act to amend The Public Commercial Vehicle Act

Bill (No. 152), The Manitoulin Rural Power District Act.

Bill (No. 153), The Power Commission Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 154), An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act.

Bill (No. 157), The Municipal Amendment Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 158), The Assessment Amendment Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 159), The Local Improvement Amendment Act, 1933.

Bill (No. 160), An Act for raising money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Bill (No. 161), An Act respecting Unemployment Relief.

Bill (No. 162), An Act to amend The Voters' List Act.

Bill (No. 163), An Act to amend The Election Act.

To these Acts the Royal Assent was announced by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly in the following words:—

"In His Majesty's name, The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills."

Mr. Speaker then said:—

May it please Your Honour:

We, His Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, in Session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to His Majesty's person and Government, and humbly beg to present for Your Honour's acceptance a Bill intituled "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending on the 31st day of October, 1933, and for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st day of October, 1934."

To this Act the Royal Assent was announced by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly in the following words:—

"The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank His Majesty's dutiful and loyal Subjects, accept their benevolence and assent to this Bill in His Majesty's name."

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to deliver the following speech:—

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly:

Your Parliamentary labours having been completed, I am enabled at this time to relieve you from further attendance at this Session of the Legislature.

Many of the problems with which you have been called upon to deal are incidental to the prevailing widespread economic conditions, and though necessitating legislation, will find their final solution in the return of normal times.

It is encouraging to observe certain signs of improvement in the commercial outlook. Agriculture is in a better position generally speaking than it was a year ago, by reason of the diminished surplus of products carried over, the upward trend of commodity values, and the success that has attended the

activities of the Marketing Board. The continued expansion of the gold mining industry is a very helpful factor in promoting the revival of business.

While the gradual reduction of unemployment is looked for, it has been considered advisable to give statutory form and authority to the plans and methods employed in dealing with the present situation. Your legislation respecting unemployment relief authorizes the Province to enter into agreements with the Dominion and with the municipalities for providing employment and direct relief. Debentures may be issued by any municipality for such municipality's share of this expenditure.

I observe with interest that you have given approval to the proposal of my Ministers to effect a substantial reduction in the membership of this House. It is satisfactory to know that, saving for differences of opinion as to details, there has been general agreement as to the wisdom of this legislation and co-operation in bringing it about.

It is a source of justifiable pride to the people of this Province that the untarnished record of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission has been sustained after many and searching investigations, and more particularly by the judicial inquiry recently reported upon. The declaration that the work and dealings of the Commission have been conducted in every respect on the highest possible principles, and with great skill and rectitude, is a vindication of the public confidence long enjoyed by the Commission.

By the acquisition of the Abitibi Power Development, mining and other industries in Northern Ontario are given the prospect of a new era of progress and development. The public investment in this undertaking is, moreover, a practical demonstration of the faith of this Province in the future of Northern Ontario. There is every reason to expect that the earnest efforts of the Commission to utilize the power resources of the Province will be successful, and will inure to the general advantage.

Your legislation for the relief of mortgagors and purchasers will serve, I trust, to reduce present hardships and anxieties of home owners, both on the farm and in centres of population, and to encourage co-operation between the interests concerned to their mutual advantage and security.

Amendments made to the Election Law will reduce the time required for the holding of an election, and will provide more speedy and better methods for the preparation of the Voters' Lists.

A measure of protection has been afforded to the public by the enactment of The Collection Agencies Act, the purpose of which is to bring all collection agencies under regulation and control. The duty of administering this law has been confided to the Ontario Securities Commission, which will license agencies and enforce the required safeguards.

No more important matter has engaged your attention than the finances of the Province. The reduction of the general expenditures, and the curtailment of grants and emoluments, will go a long way, I trust, toward meeting the unusual demands upon the provincial resources, and maintaining the sound financial position of Ontario.

A measure of relief has been extended to the counties by the school law amendments in respect to the cost of secondary education, and to the townships in respect to the grants to elementary schools. It has been provided also that school boards shall present municipal councils with full details of their financial condition when asking for the collection of school rates. Still further economy has been effected by conferring power to close schools having less than eight pupils in attendance while making provision for their education elsewhere.

Several amendments made to The Highway Traffic Act are in the interest of safety. Drivers of automobiles will hereafter be required to slow down to a maximum of twenty miles an hour at all level railway crossings. The rule governing left hand turns has been clarified to conform with the prevailing practice. Street cars must hereafter come to a full stop before entering or crossing a through highway.

By conferring authority upon judicial tribunals to prevent the publication of obscene and immoral literature you have provided a necessary measure of protection against a serious menace to the community. I am confident that public opinion will sustain your efforts in this direction.

Having regard to the importance of the protection of the fruit and vegetable industry of this Province by the operation of the salutary provisions of The Fruit Act of Canada, an Act has been passed to give statutory effect to any provisions of the Federal law which may be beyond the competence of the Dominion Parliament to enact, reserving the right of the Province to exercise its legislative authority on the subject wherever occasion may require.

An improvement in the Workmen's Compensation law has been effected by providing that when the accident record of an employer has been constantly good, the Board may reduce any contribution to the accident fund for which such employer is liable.

Legislation has also been enacted respecting the Ontario Institute of Radio-Therapy; respecting Relief Land Settlement; providing for the continuous care of War Memorials; respecting the Conveyancing of Property; to amend The Bulk Sales and The Conditional Sales Acts and for other purposes.

I thank you for the beneficial legislation you have enacted, and also for the financial provision you have made for carrying on the public services and undertakings of the Province, which will be administered in the interest alike of economy and efficiency.

In conclusion, I trust that under the blessing and guidance of Providence your labours will advance the welfare and happiness of all our people.

The Provincial Secretary then said:—

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly:

It is the will and pleasure of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued and this Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

Journals of the Legislative Assembly

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

1933

APPENDIX No. 1

Report, Minutes and Proceedings of the Standing
Committee on Public Accounts

Session of 1933

No. 1

Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts

SESSION OF 1933

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario:

GENTLEMEN:

Your Committee has had produced before it documents and correspondence and heard evidence in connection with the following items in the Public Accounts, 1932:—

Construction of Breslau Bridge, Waterloo County, Pages L 18, 19, 20, 21, Public Accounts.

B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd., Furniture, \$650.00, furniture and furnishings for buildings, Page K 17, Public Accounts.

Your Committee held in all two meetings and examined the following witnesses: R. M. Smith, Deputy Minister of Highways; George Hogarth, Deputy Minister of Public Works; H. P. Rickard, B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

W. D. BLACK,
Chairman.

Public Accounts Committee Room,
Monday, April 10th, 1933.

Minutes

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, 1933

Public Accounts Committee Room,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, April 5th, 1933.

The Select Standing Committee to whom was referred the examination of the Public Accounts of the Province for the fiscal year 1931-1932 and composed of the following Members: Messrs. Henry, Acres, Baird, Berry, Black, Blanchard, Bragg, Burt, Calder, Case, Colliver, Coté, Craig, Dunlop, Ecclestone, Elliott (Bruce), Ellis, Finlayson, Fraleigh, Freele, Harcourt, Heighington, Hill, Hipel, Honeywell, Hutchinson, Ireland, Jamieson, Jutten, Kennedy (Peel), Kenning, Lancaster, Lyons, Macaulay, Mackay, Martin (Hamilton), Martin (Brantford), Monteith, Moore, Morrison, Munro, Murphy (Beaches), Murphy (St. Patrick), Murray, McBrien, McCrea, McLean, McNaughton, McQuibban, Nesbitt, Newman, Nixon, Oakley, Oliver, Price (Parkdale), Price (York West), Reid, Robb, Robertson, St. Denis, Sangster, Seguin, Shaver, Simpson, Sinclair, Singer, Skinner, Slack, Smith (Essex), Strickland, Tweed, Willson (Niagara Falls), Wilson (Windsor)—73, met this day for organization.

Present: Messrs. Berry, Black, Blanchard, Calder, Craig, Elliott (Bruce), Finlayson, Harcourt, Hill, Hipel, Ireland, Lancaster, Nixon, Price (York West), Reid, Sinclair, Skinner.

Moved by Mr. Finlayson, seconded by Mr. Reid,

That the Honourable Mr. Black be appointed Chairman of the Committee.
Carried.

Moved by Mr. Hipel, seconded by Mr. Elliott (Bruce),

That there be laid before this Committee all vouchers, cheques, receipts, orders and memorandums referring to the items set out herewith and also all contracts, plans, correspondence and documents of every nature and kind whatsoever in relation to said items. The items appearing in the Public Accounts, 1932, to which the above motion refers are as follows:—

The following items appear on pages L 18, 19 and 20:—

Page L 18: Frank Barber & Associates, Ltd., No. 30-45, Breslau Bridge Supervision, Waterloo Township, Stratford-Guelph project, \$12,208.17.

Page L 18: Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone, Ltd., No. 30-45, Breslau Bridge approaches, Waterloo Township, Kitchener-Guelph project, \$18,671.46.

Page L 19: Standard Paving, Ltd., Nos. 970 and 1102, concrete repairs, Waterloo Township, Stratford-Guelph project, \$1,939.50.

Page L 19: Dufferin Paving and Crushed Stone, Ltd., \$140.58.

Page L 19: Canadian Inspection & Testing Co., Ltd., tests, \$39.45.

Page L 19: Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone, Ltd., laying amiesite, \$333.16.

Page L 20: Oliver Betzner, Waterloo Township, borrow pit, \$258.00.

The items appearing in the Public Accounts of 1931, of which the above motion refers, are as follows:—

Also items from Public Accounts, 1930-31, pages L 20, 21 and 22:—

Page L 20: Frank Barber & Associates, Ltd., No. 30-45, engineering fees, supervision Breslau Bridge over Grand River, Waterloo Township, Stratford-Guelph project, \$2,943.20. Dufferin Paving and Crushed Stone, Ltd., Order No. 704, Breslau Bridge approaches, Waterloo Township. Guelph-Kitchener project, \$16,758.45. Dufferin Paving and Crushed Stone, Ltd., No. 30-45, Breslau Bridge, Waterloo Township, Guelph-Kitchener project, \$94,149.29.

Page L 22: Purchase of property, Waterloo Township, borrow pit, \$300.00.

Page L 21: Property and Miscellaneous, Canadian Inspection and Testing Co., Ltd., \$27.04.

Moved by Mr. Nixon, seconded by Mr. Hipel,

That Mr. George Hogarth, Deputy Minister of Public Works, and Mr. Rickard of B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd., 28 College Street, be summoned to appear before this Committee and give evidence and bring all vouchers and records relating to item—B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd., furniture, \$650.00, furniture and furnishings for Buildings, K 17—Public Accounts, 1932.

The Committee then adjourned until Friday, April 7th, 1933, at 9.30 a.m.

SECOND SITTING

Public Accounts Committee Room,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, April 7th, 1933.

The Committee met at 10 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Black in the chair.

Present: Messrs. Acres, Baird, Berry, Blanchard, Bragg, Burt, Colliver, Craig, Harcourt, Hill, Hipel, Honeywell, Hutchinson, Ireland, Jamieson, Jutten, Lancaster, Macaulay, Mackay, Martin (Hamilton), Murphy (Beaches), McBrien, McLean, McQuibban, Nesbitt, Newman, Nixon, Oliver, Price (York West), Reid, Robertson, St. Denis, Simpson, Sinclair, Skinner, Strickland, Tweed, Wilson (Windsor).

Mr. R. M. Smith, Deputy Minister of Highways, was duly sworn and examined by Mr. Hipel and Mr. Macaulay in connection with construction of Breslau Bridge, Waterloo County, pages L 18, 19, 20, 21, Public Accounts, 1932.

Mr. George Hogarth, Deputy Minister of Public Works, was duly sworn and examined by Mr. Nixon and Mr. Finlayson in connection with B. M. & T. Jenkins, furniture, \$650—page K 17, Public Accounts, 1932.

Mr. H. P. Rickard of B. M. & T. Jenkins was duly sworn and examined by Mr. Nixon and Mr. Finlayson in connection with B. M. & T. Jenkins, furniture, \$650.00—page K 17, Public Accounts, 1932.

The Committee then adjourned for the Session.

Proceedings

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, April 5th, 1933, 10.30 a.m.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: Gentlemen, this is the first meeting of the Public Accounts Committee for the purpose of organization. The Honourable Mr. Black has acted as Chairman of the Committee for some years, and I have the honour of proposing that he act as Chairman again for this year.

A MEMBER: I second that.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: If you are all satisfied, I have much pleasure in declaring Mr. Black elected as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee for the present year, and ask him to take the Chair.

MR. BLACK (taking the Chair): Gentlemen of the Committee, I do not know that I can say anything beyond that I am pleased with the honour because of the responsibilities. However, I hope we will be able to get through the work in very short order.

Call the Roll.

What is the business before the Committee this morning?

MR. HIPEL: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion. Do you want me to read it or shall I give it to you?

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: Have you extra copies?

MR. HIPEL: I have one for the Chairman, and here is another copy.

THE CHAIRMAN (reading): "Notice of Motion: Moved by Mr. Hipel, seconded by Mr. Elliott (Bruce), That there be laid before this Committee all vouchers, cheques, receipts, orders and memorandums referring to the items set out herewith and also all contracts, plans, correspondence and documents of every nature and kind whatsoever in relation to the said items. The items appearing in the Public Accounts, 1932, to which the above motion refers are as follows:—

"The following items appear on pages L 18, 19 and 20:—

"Frank Barber and Associates, Ltd., No. 30-45, Breslau Bridge Supervision, Waterloo Township, Stratford-Guelph project, \$12,308.17.

"Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone, Ltd., No. 30-45, Breslau Bridge approaches, Waterloo Township, Kitchener-Guelph project, \$18,871.46.

"Standard Paving, Ltd., Nos. 970 and 1102, concrete repairs, Waterloo Township, Stratford-Guelph project, \$1,939.50.

"Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone, Ltd., \$140.58.

"Canadian Inspection & Testing Co., Ltd., tests, \$39.45.

"Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone, Ltd., laying amiesite, \$333.16.

"Oliver Betzner, Waterloo Township, borrow pit, \$258.00.

"The items appearing in the Public Accounts of 1931, of which the above motion refers are as follows:—

"Also items appearing in Public Accounts, 1930-31, pages L 20, 21 and 22:—

"Frank Barber and Associates, Ltd., No. 30-45, Engineering fees, supervision Breslau Bridge over Grand River, Waterloo Township, Stratford-Guelph project, \$2,943.20.

"Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone, Ltd., Order No. 704, Breslau Bridge approaches, Waterloo Township, Guelph-Kitchener project, \$16,758.45.

"Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone, Ltd., No. 30-45, Breslau Bridge, Waterloo Township, Guelph-Kitchener project, \$94,149.29.

"Purchase of property, Waterloo Township, borrow pit, \$300.00.

"Property and Miscellaneous, Canadian Inspection & Testing Co., Ltd., \$27.04."

You have heard the motion, gentlemen. Shall the motion carry? Those in favour? Contrary, if any? Carried.

MR. HIPEL: Mr. Chairman, that is about as far as we can go in this matter this morning; but, with the permission of the Committee, we might save time if they would give me permission to see the Deputy Minister of Highways in the meantime before the next meeting and get some particulars.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: You have not named any witnesses. Do you want any?

MR. HIPEL: We do not know until we have seen the documents.

MR. SINCLAIR: Mr. Hipel cannot say until he has received the document and has seen the Deputy Minister, and then he will be able to say.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: I will speak to the Deputy over there and we will be glad to expedite matters as far as we can. I will speak to Mr. Macaulay

MR. SINCLAIR: I understand Mr. Nixon has some evidence which he wishes to take up at the next meeting; and by that time Mr. Hipel will be able to tell us what next he wants.

MR. NIXON: I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by Mr. Hipel,

That Mr. George Hogarth, Deputy Minister of Public Works, and Mr. Rickard of B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd., 28 College Street, be summoned to appear before this Committee and give evidence and bring all vouchers and records relating to item: B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd., furniture, \$650, furniture and furnishings for Buildings, K 17, Public Accounts.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard this motion as read by Mr. Nixon, gentlemen. Is it your pleasure that it be carried? Carried.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: These we might be able to go on with next Friday. If you find out what you want, we might arrange for some witnesses to be here. This will not take up any very great length of time, or will it?

MR. HIPEL: It depends upon the information which I get from the Department beforehand, but I shall be glad to co-operate and get it finished up.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: It is only that it is getting near Easter, and if we could dispose of the business on Friday, it would make it that much easier.

MR. HIPEL: I think we all want to get away as soon as we can.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: Is there any chance of getting yours on and over on Friday?

MR. NIXON: I do not know.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: I would suggest it might be convenient for us to meet on Friday morning at, say, 9.30, and then try and make some progress.

I move that we adjourn until 9.30 on Friday morning.

AN HON. MEMBER: I second that motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Finlayson, you have the other Committee on that day.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: Yes, but I think we can arrange it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are all agreed? Carried.

(Committee adjourned to meet again on Friday next, at 9.30 a.m.)

SECOND SITTING

Friday, April 7th, 1933, 9.30 a.m.

HON. MR. BLACK in the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, if you will come to order we will start proceedings. I believe Mr. Hogarth is here this morning.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Mr. Hipel, I believe, wanted to take up the Breslau Bridge first.

MR. HIPEL: Mr. Smith is here.

R. M. SMITH, sworn. Examined by MR. HIPEL:

Q. You are Deputy Minister?

A. Yes.

Q. In connection with the Breslau Bridge project, the Department called for tenders around April 8th, 1930?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it the practice of your Department to advertise publicly for tenders for constructions?

A. Yes.

Q. I believe your call for the Breslau Bridge was included in a large list of work which was advertised about April 8th, 1930?

A. I am not sure, but I believe that is correct.

Q. Those tenders were to close on that day, April 21st?

A. They were to have closed on April 21st, but that time was extended.

Q. About three weeks?

A. Yes.

Q. Which would make it—

A. May 14th.

Q. That is 1930?

A. Yes.

Q. In submitting prices for the work, did the contractors base their tender on a single or were there alternative designs?

A. The contractors were permitted to submit their own design to bid on a departmental design.

Q. How many designs did the Department ask bids on?

A. Two.

Q. These would be known, I presume, as design or plan—

A. We had them marked, I believe, A and B.

Q. A and B or 1 and 2?

A. Yes.

Q. These are the designs?

A. Yes, this is one.

Q. These contractors, if they wished, could tender on one or more?

A. Yes, or submit their own plan, if they desired.

Q. How many designs did the Department actually receive tenders on, then?

A. Four.

Q. You have a list of the firms that tendered?

A. Yes.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: You called the first two A and B. And would you call the others C and D?

A. Yes.

Q. That is the alternative designs?

A. Yes.

MR. HIPEL: You have a list of the firms?

A. Yes.

Q. You were going to let me have it to-day?

A. Yes. I do not know whether I have them all here or not.

Q. Why was not the lowest tender accepted on your A and B?

A. There were, as I say, four different designs. The matter of the analysis of these bridges took some time because, as you will appreciate, they were of different types and styles. We eventually dropped our B scheme altogether. The River Grand, as any of you gentlemen who know the Grand River will know, is a pretty dangerous and treacherous river; and I was just a little sceptical about our B design from the first; and we finally dropped that one altogether; so that really A, C and D were still to be considered.

Q. Who actually advised against accepting the lowest tender? I suppose that was left largely to the Minister in his discretion?

A. I could not say; it is not always policy to accept the lowest tender in any case. We frequently get into trouble by taking the lowest tender, in that the extras and lots of things happen afterwards, and the contractor is trying to get his money back.

MR. NIXON: Did you say policy or politics?

A. It is not always wise.

MR. HIPEL: Q. Were these contractors who bid on A and B asked to furnish a maintenance bond at all?

A. No, we do not ask for maintenance bonds.

Q. Unit prices were asked for?

A. Yes.

Q. Who designed these four different plans?

A. All of them were worked at in our own departmental office, and two of them were designed by Frank Barber.

Q. We are given to understand then, that the Department furnished two plans and Frank Barber, in conjunction with the Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone Company, furnished two?

A. Yes.

Q. That is correct?

A. Yes.

Q. I understand that you have very competent bridge engineers in your own Department, and your own department designed the bridge at Hogs Hollow?

A. Yes.

Q. At Paris?

A. Yes.

Q. At Caledonia?

A. Yes.

Q. And, as a matter of fact practically all the major bridges have been designed by your own department prior to this?

A. Well, not always. There have been a few cases where we have consulted firms. For instance, the bridge at Fergus, Mr. Connell was consulted there.

Q. But, as a matter of fact, that at Paris, Hogs Hollow and Caledonia were designed by your department?

A. Yes, and at Hogs Hollow we used the design at Leaside, to a very large extent.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Who designed the Leaside Bridge?

A. Frank Barber.

MR. HIPEL: I presume there would be considerable saving by having your own bridge engineers rather than employing outside designing engineers?

A. That year we had a big programme. I had only two engineers who might be classed as bridge engineers, Mr. Lamont and Mr. Sedgewick, and they had a pretty busy year that year, without regard to this structure.

Q. Two and a half per cent., I believe, is the usual fee for this class of work?

A. Yes.

Q. The designs A and B were by the Department, and plans C and D are by Barber?

A. Yes.

Q. Employed by the Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone Company?

A. I presume he was, as far as that is concerned. The plan was submitted with their tender.

Q. Did your department ask Barber to associate himself with your engineers in submitting a design, or just to go ahead and design a bridge himself to fit in with the conditions?

A. In preparing the plan which was submitted with the tenders by the outside firms, Barber had to come to the Department to find out what specifications we were using, and wanted to know the width; and that was the only thing we gave him.

Q. Why would a design then be allowed by Barber—simply through the Dufferin Construction Company, who submitted the tender?

A. Oh, well, any contractor could have submitted a plan. There was nothing to prevent any firm; they all knew that they had that privilege; and if any firm downtown had desired to submit an alternative plan we would have given them any information we could to permit of that design.

Q. Just who from the Highways Department is generally in touch with this man Barber?

A. Mr. A. A. Smith, the Chief Engineer.

Q. The Chief Engineer—not you?

A. No.

Q. Were there peculiar conditions existing at Breslau that made your department feel that outside experience and skill was needed?

A. Well, as I said before, it is a treacherous river; two bridges in that area had failed within just a matter of a few years before this, or one of them just a matter of a couple of years before; and we had also had trouble of our own at Freeport. We had built a new bridge at Freeport, and within a year after that bridge was constructed the freshet condition tore out a lot of material under the piers and damaged the bridge very severely. It is a treacherous river.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: And that was in the same county?

A. Yes, and within a very short distance. And the Canadian National, within 300 feet away, had their bridge destroyed. I felt it was advisable to have a consultant on that job.

MR. HIPEL: Of course your experience at Freeport and the experience of the C.N.R. would give your department information which possibly outside consulting engineers would not have?

A. Yes, but we did not have the information on the Canadian National situation until after this job was actually called for.

Q. Would it be fair to ask you this question, then: Is it the usual practice of the Department to allow outside engineers to prepare plans and have contractors submit figures on their designs, when these designs are not available to all contractors?

A. Well, it is not a common practice.

Q. Were any other consulting engineers asked to submit a bid or to submit plans?

A. Well, we did not ask any consultant firm. The information was given to the contractors or the bidders to the effect that they could submit any plan they liked, as long as it agreed with our specifications. We did not know what firms would work on it.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Any contractor could ask any engineer to prepare a plan, and he could submit a bid on that plan?

A. Yes.

MR. NIXON: After you had supplied a plan and had a new plan submitted by another, an outside engineer, do you not again begin and ask for tenders on it?

A. We took it up later.

MR. SINCLAIR: Might I suggest that you let Mr. Hipel get along with his examination, because he is not a lawyer.

MR. HIPEL: I am quite agreeable, if the Minister wishes to ask me a question at any time as we go along.

Q. Did any consulting engineer approach the Department and ask permission to submit plans, beside Barber?

A. I do not recall that they did.

Q. I would gather then that this man Barber was not invited to submit a design, but he approached the Department himself?

A. No, he did not, in the first instance. The tender which came in with the Dufferin bid had Barber's plan on it. Barber did not come to the Department in the first instance. It was a matter of the contractor tendering with Barber's plan, when the contractors knew that they could put in alternative plans of their own.

Q. I suppose in a case of this kind this man Barber would simply invite a few contractors of his own choosing?

A. I know that he saw a good many contractors.

Q. In other words, this man Barber would simply ask a few of his own family compact, you might say, of the general contractors?

A. I know that several of the contracting firms phoned me and asked about a time extension in connection with putting a bid in on Barber's alternative design.

Q. Who did this man Barber approach in your department? I suppose your bridge engineer?

A. When?

Q. In connection with the details?

A. After the tenders were in, do you mean?

Q. About that time, yes.

A. After the tenders were in, I believe he saw Mr. Henry; he also saw me. He came to me and contended that his design was the cheapest of the lot and should be given consideration.

Q. Was there any question raised at that time, to your knowledge, as to his fee supposing his design was accepted or rejected?

A. How do you mean?

Q. When he approached the Minister of Highways at that time.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Do you mean this two and a half per cent.?

MR. HIPEL: Yes.

WITNESS: No, that was not discussed until the following year.

Q. I would be right in saying that it is not the usual practice of your department to allow an engineer to submit a design in competition with your own bridge engineers, but you rather call them in as consulting engineers in connection with your department?

A. There is nothing at any time to prevent a firm submitting their own plans. We have quite a number of other cases in which other plans have been submitted. Not in this case but in other cases; but they were not considered.

Q. Are there any bridges on the system where outside engineer's designs have been used?

A. There is one at Fergus.

Q. That is the only one?

A. That is the only one which I think of just now. It is, though, common practice; and that applies practically everywhere. We will pay 50 per cent. of the county cost, and practically on all county projects of any size they employ a consulting engineer; and we permit it, although we act in a consultant capacity too, we allow them to employ any other one and we pay 50 per cent. of its cost.

Q. Then I am right in this that you had tenders on two designs and you had bids on four?

A. Yes, that is right.

Q. And you are prepared to give me the tenders. In fact I just glanced over them yesterday in your Department. On the A design, you cannot tell me offhand how many tenders you had on that?

A. No.

Q. Or on B or C?

A. I know that on B we just had the two.

Q. Who were they from?

A. The McGregor company and the Dufferin Construction. I think you have both of those.

Q. Yes, I have copies. Do you know whether this McGregor construction company when they submitted their tender in competition with the Dufferin Paving and Crushed Stone Company were asked, or was it intimated to them that they had to include \$4,000.00 in their tender to either pay Barber or the Dufferin Paving company for the plans?

A. I do not think so. I never heard of that.

Q. Do you know that that is common gossip in Waterloo County?

A. As a matter of fact I did not know it until you told me. I doubt very much if that is the case.

Q. Originally the tenders, you say, were to close on April 21st, but were extended until May 14th?

A. Yes.

Q. But you did not let a contract on Plan D until December 9th?

A. No.

Q. From May 14th to December 9th, there was no contract?

A. No, that is right.

Q. After considerable thought, the Department decided to accept the Barber design and throw your own departmental plans into the waste paper basket?

HON. MR. MACAULAY: No, they kept them on the file.

WITNESS: Well, B, as I told you before, we were always sceptical about; it was prepared in a hurry, and it was a design which I was afraid to put in the river; and we dropped it entirely. And C was not put in the waste paper basket; we thought it was a pretty fair design, but it was not as low in cost as design D.

MR. HIPEL: And your department thought that the design by Barber was a superior design to the bridge engineers' designs from your department?

A. Well, they were typical; they both had a high arch. Candidly I was not particularly keen on either our own or Barber's, but it was the less of two evils—it was going to cost less.

Q. I suppose your bridge engineers checked over the Barber design?

A. Oh yes, we were working all summer on that. That was the reason of the delay.

Q. They did not acknowledge it was superior?

A. No, there was no acknowledgment on either side.

Q. According to this memorandum which I have here from your files he reported advising against accepting plan C or D?

A. Yes, I know he was opposed to it at the time.

Q. He made a full report on this, and showed that on Plan B the amount would be about \$61,000 as against C or \$79,000, and D about the same price?

A. That was before we decided to drop the B plan altogether. At that time he was supporting it; but afterwards it was found, on a further analysis of B plan there were certain quantities left out. For instance, there was a correction of some 160 some odd cubic yards in the superstructure, and of 67 cubic yards in the substructure, which were not found until later.

Q. That is all outlined in this memorandum. I asked you before what arrangements were made with Barber first as to engineering costs when his design was accepted?

A. We paid him two and a half per cent.

Q. Were these arrangements made with you, your bridge engineer, or the Minister of Highways, the Premier—who was then Minister of Highways?

A. Mr. Henry. I am not certain of that, but I think Mr. Barber's letter was addressed to me, offering to handle the work at that price; and Mr. A. A. Smith wrote telling him we would be prepared to pay him that price.

Q. The costs, I presume, were for the design and supervision, in other words a completed job, so far as engineering was concerned?

A. With the exception of inspecting.

Q. I suppose the question of grading, pavement, subway, and so on, was not discussed at this time?

A. No, Barber had no part in that.

Q. Your original arrangement just covered the bridge, with Barber?

A. Yes, there was the grading of the approach, on which we had 20,000 yards allowed.

Q. The original design B on which bids were received closed on the 14th May?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that the design that is actually built at Breslau now?

A. No, it is not.

Q. What changes were made?

A. Late that fall our policy was changed; we decided on a 30-foot floor instead of a 24-foot floor; and when we decided on that additional width of floor, it made a change entirely in the design. I was not anxious then to build one of the high class; so we asked the successful contractor on the job to let us have another plan, a beam type of structure, only making it 30 feet in width; and it was the second plan which he submitted which we approved.

Q. You say beam type?

A. Yes.

Q. How many piers are in this new design now?

A. There are, I think, four piers with two approach piers.

Q. In other words the tender of the Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone, Limited, on the original design of Barber's was plan D, which was accepted?

A. Yes.

Q. After it was accepted, practically the whole design was changed to E?

A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. It is also true that this design D was accepted as against two of your own designs?

A. As I tell you, one design of ours had been dropped in the early stages; at the very beginning we had dropped that one.

Q. This plan D of Barber's is what you call an overhead bow?

A. Yes.

Q. But the actual bridge which was constructed is, as you said a minute ago, a beam-slab type?

A. Yes.

Q. This design of Barber's D on which you let the contract is really a radical departure from what was usual?

A. No, we have another one very typical of that at Plantagenet, almost exactly the same as that structure.

Q. How about the spans in length?

A. I cannot give you that exactly, but it is very close to this span, two long spans of much the same style.

Q. Not nearly as long a span, or at least somewhat shorter?

A. It is not very much shorter; they are long spans. I can find out for you exactly what they are, if you wish.

Q. I would be right in saying that the McGregor Construction Company were a little lower in figuring on those plans, because they were just above the ordinary?

A. I would not know that, of course. I did not prepare the tender.

Q. Your unit prices submitted were much higher on D than on any of the others?

A. Yes, but the quantities were a lot less.

Q. Then design D was changed to E, practically a new bridge as far as the plan was concerned?

A. Yes, practically a new design.

Q. Were these contractors who tendered on design D, for instance McGregor, given a chance to figure on this design E?

A. No. The contract had been really let to the Dufferin in the first place.

Q. Was the firm who submitted either the lowest or the second lowest tender on the original bids given an opportunity to tender on plans D and E? They were given an opportunity on D, if they wanted to?

A. Yes, and on C.

Q. But not on E?

A. No.

Q. No one else was given an opportunity to tender on E?

A. No.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: But the unit prices given were those in the original tender.

MR. HIPEL: I will come to that.

Q. The names of the contractors who submitted bids on the D were just the two?

A. There were three; the Nelson River also—

Q. On D?

A. No, not on D.

Q. You gave me certain information as to quantities on A, B, C, D and E. These are the figures given me yesterday?

A. Yes, those are the ones taken from the tenders.

Q. And those are also the estimates of quantities?

A. There are additional quantities which do not appear, but as far as I could I put them in there.

Q. In other words, those figures are correct?

A. Yes, so far as they went.

(See Appendix "A.")

Q. This design E, what did that actually cost?

A. The finished job, \$129,000 odd.

Q. That is the answer to the question on the Order Paper?

A. Yes.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: How much did you say it cost?

A. A little over \$129,000—\$129,060.29.

MR. HIPEL: You said a minute ago that Barber's fee was supposed to be two and a half per cent. of the cost?

A. Yes.

Q. What was Barber actually paid? Am I right in saying that his fees were \$1,089.86 and \$2,943.30?

A. Yes, those are correct.

Q. This was to cover design and supervision, in other words the whole of the engineering costs, so far as the Department was concerned?

A. Yes, and his expenses.

Q. Who did the boring and preliminary work in connection with it, say to ascertain the ground conditions?

A. The Department did that.

Q. Am I right in saying that the Department paid for that?

A. Yes, that is a cost we always assumed ourselves; any preliminary plans, any surveys, engineering and that kind of thing we assume ourselves.

Q. Were these costs deducted from Barber's fees?

A. No.

Q. They were not deducted?

A. No.

Q. I suppose this man, Barber, in supervising the bridge, had complete inspectors supervising the job?

A. Yes, there were first-class men there.

Q. Would they be paid out of his fee?

A. No, his fee is two and a half per cent.; the Department pays for any additional inspection necessary.

Q. Then I gather that the Department had their own inspectors on the job during the construction of the bridge?

A. Yes.

Q. This man, Gilbert, who was on there as an inspector—

A. He was the engineer in charge as supervising engineer.

Q. And you paid him what?

A. Two hundred dollars a month.

Q. Who did he have helping him? A man by the name of Barber?

A. Yes, he was on as a rod man.

Q. That is Donald Barber?

A. D. Barber; I presume that may be his name.

Q. What relation would he be to Barber the Consulting Engineer?

A. I do not know, but I understand his son.

Q. Who paid for his time then?

A. The Department would. The fees that applied on that would be the same as far as any consultant who would be employed.

Q. Could you give me the total amount which was paid by the Department for inspection and so on?

A. Including outside inspection and all?

Q. Barber's fee was over \$4,000, now what were the inspectors' total fees in that connection?

A. Gilbert received \$2,064.10, and Barber received \$880.59. The Barber items which you have include his expenses and his fee.

Q. Of course his expenses were small?

A. Well, he had quite a lot of running back and forth from Toronto to do.

Q. According to the figures submitted yesterday, his expenses were very small in comparison with the total amount?

HON. MR. MACAULAY: We would not know what the expenses were?

A. Yes, we paid those in addition.

MR. HIPEL: Then your inspectors' fees would be \$2,064?

A. And Barber, \$880.59. The other two men were there more or less permanently.

Q. Which would mean close to \$7,000?

A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Who checked the final quantities on this work?

A. Barber would, with Gilbert, of course, certifying. Gilbert would certify as to the quantities and return them, and Barber would have to approve of them. Barber was in the position exactly as any district engineer of ours would be in handling any job.

Q. But, in the first place, he was in the employ of the Dufferin Construction, who had the bridge contract?

A. He had been prior to the plan being approved.

Q. At the time they submitted their tender, he was in their employ?

A. Yes.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: He was just employed to prepare the plan, not in the sense that he was an employee who had been working for them?

A. He had prepared the plan.

MR. HIPEL: And possibly some other work?

A. I do not know. I never heard of him doing any other work for them; he may have, but I do not know it.

Q. The Prime Minister, who was Minister of Highways at that time, sanctioned the changes in the bridge construction?

A. Mr. Henry approved of the second plan.

Q. And also the payments to Barber and the inspectors, and so on?

HON. MR. MACAULAY: It was all finished before I came on the job, was it not?

A. Yes, everything had been arranged before you came on the job. The bridge was all finished, but the approaches were not completed.

MR. HIPEL: Who actually signed the contract?

A. Mr. Henry.

Q. This may not be a fair question, but I am going to ask you anyhow: In what way, in your opinion, did the subsequent building of the Canadian National Railways subway affect the final cost of the bridge proper? As stated by Premier Henry in the House the other day, so far as the building of the subway was concerned, that was separate and had no effect upon the cost of the complete bridge itself?

A. No, not in a general way, but it did in this way: It was because we knew we could get the subway constructed at the same time that we decided definitely on the change in the width of the structure. It was because of the bad turn in the road, and so on, that we decided on the wider structure then; and I also considered the change in the design of the bridge because I did not like the posts in the road to obstruct the view, as they would have if we had had the narrow bridge with the construction of the subway.

Q. What posts do you mean?

A. The superstructure, if we had gone ahead with the old design.

Q. Have you got a copy of the plan of the diversion?

A. Yes, here is a little sketch.

Q. The subway and the bridge are about 500 feet apart?

A. About 1,200 feet apart.

Q. In other words, the building of this would not affect the building of the other. I mean that they were two separate operations?

A. Yes, they were; and yet they had to be considered together for the whole project. At the time tenders were called for originally, the bridge alignment had not been decided upon; we did not know whether we could get the subway through or not. It was subsequent to the tenders being called for that we obtained consent from the Railway Board at Ottawa to assistance by way of subsidy on the subway.

Q. But as a matter of fact the two bridges are 1,200 feet apart?

A. Yes.

Q. And they were separate operations?

A. Yes.

Q. Did this Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone Company actually file a maintenance bond on this bridge?

A. No, we do not require a maintenance bond on any structure or on any type of pavement.

Q. So that there is no maintenance bond at all?

A. No, we have not required one for years.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: We make them build so good that we know we can take care of maintenance.

MR. HIPEL: We will come to that later on.

Q. To your knowledge, did this man, Barber, at the time the tender was first called for and the letting of the contract owe any money to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Highways or to the Dufferin Construction Company.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: That is a perfectly impertinent question. You should have notified me about a question like that so that I could have got an immediate answer. You should not ask a question like that unless you can show some reason for asking it.

WITNESS: I have never heard of such a thing. I hope he did not, anyway.

MR. HIPEL: From the correspondence it looks as if this man, Barber, worked in the interests of the Dufferin Construction and Paving Company perhaps more than in the interests of the taxpayers or even of your department. For instance, he recommended that the contractor be paid 10 cents per foot more for driving piles than was agreed upon?

A. In our original specifications, the contractors could drive soft-wood piles, whereas it was possible to get hard-wood piles, and at 10 cents additional at the time I thought that was a fair price.

Q. Is it not harder to drive pine piles, that is with the flare at the bottom?

A. As a matter of fact, while he had bid on soft-wood piles, he could not have driven a soft-wood pile in there at all, as I found out afterwards.

Q. Your department did not furnish the piles?

A. No, he furnished the piles, and his bid covered furnishing and driving.

Q. And, as a matter of fact, the elm piles drive much better than the soft-wood piles?

A. Yes, they would not break and smash off at the ends. As a matter of fact when we got on into the bottom of that excavation, we could not have driven anything but hard wood; and we found that out and he agreed that he would drive hard wood for ten cents more.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Mr. Hipel is asking why you had hard wood?

A. Because it was a much better type of pile. Elm piles would last generation after generation.

MR. HIPEL: Why didn't you use white-oak piles?

A. They would cost plenty to get white-oak piles there.

Q. They could have been obtained within ten miles?

A. I did not know that, but we could get the hard wood, the elm piles.

Q. And if these piles could be driven so much better and easier, the contractor would have saved the ten cents?

A. I do not know whether it is easier or not, but I know that the hard-wood piles were much higher class than the others.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Who paid for the piles?

A. He did.

Q. Did they cost him more?

A. I do not know that, but I know it was a much superior pile to put down.

MR. HIPEL: According to your information, what is the difference between the elm pile and the oak pile as to life?

A. I do not know. I do not know whether anybody has ever dug up a pile from such a structure. But when you put those piles down below water, I know none of us will be there to know whether they have rotted or not.

Q. I have figures here showing the life of the various kinds of piles in years.

Taking white oak as a basis at 100 per cent., elm would only last 50 to 70 in the various grades—

MR. NIXON: And what is pine?

WITNESS: He had to supply jack pine, and it would be 35 to 40.

Q. And cedar?

A. I do not think we have ever driven cedar. I do not think you could get cedar; but he had the privilege of getting jack pine; and these figures which Mr. Hipel has show 35 to 40, as compared with 50 to 70 for elm; he could have driven jack pine. White oak would possibly have been better, but would be more costly, I would think. They would be entirely under water, and I never would have thought of going to the extra expense for white oak, nor I would not anticipate that they would ever rot in this world.

Q. You said the tenders were closed on May 14th, and the contract was let on December 9th; and between those times it was evident that Barber did a lot of lobbying, especially with the Prime Minister—

HON. MR. MACAULAY: There is no evidence of that.

MR. HIPEL: Wait until I get through with the question. There is no doubt, according to the correspondence which is here, he evidently did a lot of lobbying to try to show to the Prime Minister that by accepting that design you could get rid of a lot of cement?

A. As a matter of fact, I suppose we had half a dozen meetings that summer in which they got very very heated in their arguments. I know that almost invariably after these meetings, which generally took place in my office, he would write to the Prime Minister saying I was not fair or was taking what was not a fair position.

Q. He was repeatedly in touch with the Prime Minister?

A. I do not know whether he saw the Prime Minister, but he kept writing him.

MR. HIPEL: I would like to put in this correspondence.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: I would like to look them over before you put them in. We let you have access to our files.

MR. HIPEL: I may say that Mr. Smith was very fair with me and co-operated with me; and I have struck out a lot of questions that I was going to ask him. Will you take a look at that last paragraph, there?

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Yes.

MR. NIXON: Are you going to give a question founded upon that paragraph?

MR. HIPEL: "I make no excuse for contractors who bid too high, but I believe that the three contractors bidding on our plans are little if any too high to make a fair profit. There is a great difference in cost on equal bidding, as shown in the difference between quantities of A, C and D. Of course we think the tenders around \$50,000 on scheme A are at least \$15,000 too low to allow for a fair profit."

WITNESS: That sort of correspondence happens on nearly every job.

MR. NIXON: Was that signed by Barber?

A. Yes. That was his own opinion. I do not suppose there was a job let when prices were so low as they are now, when somebody does not contend that the bidders could not do the contract for the price.

MR. HIPEL: This correspondence on B was before the contract was let?

A. Yes.

Q. Your correspondence shows that?

A. Yes.

Q. Am I right in saying this, then, that the Prime Minister let this contract to this company against the wishes of your bridge engineering department, at a much higher price on a unit basis than the original bids?

A. It is not a matter of unit prices but it is a matter of actual cost. While a unit bid might be two dollars, if the quantity was only two cubic yards, it would be different entirely from what it would be if the quantity was one hundred cubic yards and the price was only one dollar.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: One design might be more economical in materials?

A. Yes. There has been no doubt in my mind ever since this was considered, that the scheme D, regardless of any evidence, was the cheapest. There is no doubt in my mind that, and the question is whether we were satisfied with it or not. I can say, as far as I was concerned, that I did not like it. I did not like the idea; but, as far as the actual cost was concerned, scheme D was on a complete analysis of the job the cheapest. I knew it would stand up, but I did not like the look of it. It was the case of a barn when I wanted a house. I did not like the look of it; but as far as the actual cost was concerned, it was the cheapest any way you wanted to look at it.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: The Prime Minister would prefer a barn to a house, if it was cheaper, wouldn't he?

A. I do not know. I know it was cheaper.

MR. HIPEL: According to the correspondence, the Prime Minister overruled your engineers, and here is a memorandum to that effect.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Oh, I would not say that. They were talking and consulting back and forth.

WITNESS: This matter became so that it got to be a weekly meeting. Sedgewick and Barber were not at all friendly.

MR. HIPEL: That is your bridge engineer?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, as a matter of fact, this contract was let on December 9th, and then the Minister of Highways at that time had those plans completely changed to a beam and slab design, getting more or less back to one of your original designs—not altogether but more or less to your standard highway construction?

A. No, that was not standard. As a matter of fact we had been building with the arch type almost entirely before this, but I was trying to get away from the arch type. The arch type at Freeport, for instance, and at Caledonia and a great many other structures.

Q. But the arch type on D, the spans were longer?

A. Yes.

Q. And you reverted back to more piers and a beam construction, which was a little nearer to the standard form of structure?

A. No, it was not. We had no structure of that kind before, that I can think of just now. These were the arch and were the type we had been developing, but I was anxious to get away from that and have been protesting it, for instance, on the Toronto-Hamilton highway. When we came to widen the Toronto-Hamilton highway we had to tear out one of those arch designs in order to widen it.

Q. The type was completely changed and you used a beam and slab construction?

A. Yes, on my recommendation.

Q. Then about February 5th you relet this job to the Dufferin Paving?

A. No, it was simply approving in the second case of the modified or changed plan.

Q. In other words he was given another contract?

A. No, the contractor signed on the bridge plan, and there was no change excepting that the Dufferin Company were told to go ahead. I do not know whether they really knew what they were working on.

Q. You agreed to pay the unit prices as submitted on design D?

A. Yes. You see our contracts at the present time say that plans can be

changed in any way we like and modified, and the contractor has no redress. We can do anything, practically, and we change the plans quite frequently after the contract is started. In this instance, we wanted a wider bridge, which changed the thing completely.

Q. Then I am right in saying that none of the companies who originally tendered on any of these plans were given an opportunity to bid on plan E?

A. That is correct.

Q. In other words, from May 14th to December 9th, after tenders were accepted, on that date you let the contract to the Dufferin Paving and Crushed Stone Company, and immediately the contract was let there was a process of revamping the whole structure, and then they were finally authorized to go ahead around the 14th or 15th February?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, between those dates, between May and December, to February, is it not a fact that materials dropped materially in price?

A. We supplied all the materials, steel reinforcing and cement—

HON. MR. MACAULAY: That was not in the contractor's bid.

MR. HIPEL: But the contractor had to supply his forms and material, and those materials dropped considerably between May and December?

A. I could not say; I cannot recall how prices were at that time.

Q. That being more or less a fact—

HON. MR. MACAULAY: I do not think it is a fact. Is it?

MR. HIPEL: We will go back over the records.

Q. If the Department had asked for tenders on this plan B, and publicly advertised for tenders, do you not think that they would have been able to get better prices than these unit prices on B?

A. I cannot say. They might, but I could not say.

Q. I have a few more questions on the grading and the paving, and then I want to make a summary on the tenders. There was considerable grading on the approaches and so on for this bridge?

A. Yes.

Q. Were public tenders called on this work?

A. The grading was part of this bridge. Tenders were called, yes.

Q. That was part of the approach?

A. Yes.

Q. And not separately advertised?

A. No.

Q. Those tenders were closed on what date?

A. They were the same time as the bridge.

Q. May 14th?

A. Yes.

Q. When were the contracts let for this grade?

A. At the same time as the bridge.

Q. How many tenders did you receive on the grading?

A. They all bid on the grading; I do not know how many, but there would be possibly twenty tenders.

Q. But on the plan D, which you accepted?

A. There were just the two.

Q. What were their bids?

A. You have both of those.

Q. The Dufferin Construction Company bid 60 cents?

A. That is right.

Q. And the MacGregor Company bid 55 cents. So that the lowest bidder did not get the contract on that?

MR. NIXON: That is the fact, is it?

A. The approach was part of the bridge. It was not a matter of unit prices on the approach, but it was the total cost. Sixty cents was the bid price on this bridge approach. But there were other prices in MacGregor's tender which were much higher than in the Dufferin; and it was when you added them up that you found which was the cheaper job.

MR. HIPEL: What was the estimated quantity of material required—that was about 20,000 cubic yards?

A. About 20,000—that was for the 24-foot structure. That was on the thought that we would not have the subway.

Q. What amount was actually paid for?

A. 36,487 yards.

Q. That is almost twice as much?

A. Of course that 20,000 yards, as I told you, was for a narrow structure and was simply to get back to the old road again. When we decided to complete the subway at the same time, that meant an entirely different grading for the bridge. That was affected by the subway.

Q. Was this payment for the grading made in bank measurement?

A. Excavated measurement. We measured up the borrow pit, you remember.

Q. So that there was no truck measurement or fill measurement?

A. No.

Q. Who supplied the borrow pit?

A. We bought the borrow pit.

Q. Then the actual price paid to the Dufferin Company was 60 cents a yard?

A. Yes.

Q. How does this price compare with other grading jobs let during that same year?

A. The average price for grading that year—that is the average on grading jobs not on bridge approaches, was 36 cents; but on bridge approach work it was just over 56 cents. We had quite a few bridges called for that same year, and I took the average price, and those came to just over 56 cents.

Q. This was more or less a grading job?

A. We had more than a mile haul.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: That is over the average?

A. Oh yes. On a grading job the average would not be over 500 feet.

MR. HIPEL: He had a good road and a good pit?

A. No, we had to haul over the road and over the track.

Q. Part of it was over pavement?

A. I think they would have about a mile and a half haul—over a mile.

Q. Some of it would be under a mile and some of it over, to where it was deposited?

A. Yes. Most of it was right to the bridge, because there was some earth which was taken from the subway, that was used further along the grade.

Q. But he had exceptionally good material to work with and a good depth of fill?

A. Well, he had to consolidate all that fill. We had him consolidate that so that we could have it.

Q. I was going to ask who the Minister was who sanctioned this work—that was with the Prime Minister?

HON. MR. MACAULAY: I am not ashamed of it at all.

MR. HIPEL: He had nothing to do with that?

A. As a matter of fact when we knew that we had to take down the old bridge, and the township wanted the old bridge, we asked the Dufferin to consolidate this fill, and he was really entitled to something additional, because that was something unusual and not common practice, and we did not expect the contractor to do that.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: He had to haul it over that loose stuff?

A. Yes, we had him do that; and the reason we did that was so that we might have the paving done, so that we could take down the old bridge; and that was an added cost on his part.

MR. HIPEL: That would be a small amount per cubic yard?

A. Well, that was quite a consideration.

Q. Who did the cross-section work on the pits?

A. Our own engineers

Q. Who did the engineering on the grading?

A. Our own engineers.

Q. This man, Barber, and his Associates had nothing to do with the engineering or the inspection on the grading?

A. He would have on that approach.

Q. Would he be paid his percentage on the grading?

A. Just on the approach.

Q. I presume you had inspectors of your own on that grading job?

A. Oh yes.

Q. And you paid for them?

A. Yes.

Q. What amount of money was on the grading work charged for engineering services, your total?

A. I could not tell you. I would have to find that out.

Q. Your total cost of grading, as given by the Minister of Highways on Votes and Proceedings on March 8th, 1933, was \$27,796.40. How was that total made up? You had 36,487 cubic yards at 60 cents?

A. Yes. Then, after he got away from the bridge, we contended, while his price was 60 cents and according to our contract he could have put in the entire quantity at 60 cents, that the 60 cents should not apply after he got away from what might classify as approach; and we paid him 40 cents per cubic yard; and there were 14,200 cubic yards additional from the same borrow pit.

Q. For 20,000 yards you paid him 60 cents?

A. And then, after he got away from the bridge, we paid him 40 cents. There were 60,000 cubic yards in this entire approach from end to end. That is all 60 cents, as you have it; but then after that we took the stand—this quantity was increased by the widening of the structure from 20,000 to 36,000; and then our attitude was that his job as contractor for building the approach was finished and he was through, but there were still some 14,300 cubic yards required to complete the balance of the grading; and we allowed him 40 cents on that from the same borrow pit.

MR. NIXON: And he did not object at all?

A. Yes, he did; he made a lot of objections, contending that according to his contract he was entitled to 60 cents on all the grading that was there; but we, anyway, allowed him only 40 cents; and that was the price he was paid for the balance of this work. I really think, Mr. Nixon, that legally, taking our contract, he could have forced us to pay the 60 cents for the balance of it; but he accepted the 40 cents anyway.

Q. He did not want to get in wrong with the Department?

A. He was working around here a long time.

MR. HIPEL: Q. You estimated 20,000 yards, and that ran up to 36,487 cubic yards, and you paid him 60 cents for that, and then for the balance of 14,300 yards you paid him 40 cents?

A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Then we come to the paving. Were public tenders called for the paving?

A. No, they were not.

Q. Who advised not calling for tenders?

A. I recommended that the contract be given to this contractor.

Q. I suppose the Minister of Highways knew that tenders were not being called for this work?

A. I presume he did. We had two contracting firms in on this job at that time. In the meantime, the subway job had been let to a construction company and they were putting earth in on this job and the Dufferin were consolidating it. Then on top of that the Township of Woolwich was anxious to have that old bridge, and we wanted to remove the old bridge because we wanted part of the abutments of the old bridge to use as rip-rap. If we wanted this bridge completed, there was no time to be lost; and knowing he was consolidating his grade, and knowing that we would have to have a detour for another year, if this was not completed, I recommended that he have the contract.

Q. The Department or the Minister of Highways knew for months ahead that this little stretch in between would be paved?

A. Yes. We did not know that there was to be any request to have that old bridge removed. We always had thought we would have the use of that old bridge.

Q. The Department knew for months ahead that they would require a pavement there?

A. It was not a very big job and the contractor was not paid an exorbitant price. It was only a little job.

Q. The Department then simply gave the contract to the Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone Company?

A. Yes.

Q. There were no tenders?

A. Yes.

Q. On what basis was the contract let to them?

A. At so much a yard.

Q. What price was paid?

A. \$1.59.

Q. They originally asked for considerably more, did they not?

A. Their bid was \$1.85. We tried to determine what they should be paid, keeping in mind the length of haul and the work that they had to do. Mr. A. A. Smith and I arrived at that price.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: They did not fix the price?

A. No, and they protested the price, but at the time we tried to arrive at what was fair.

MR. HIPEL: You fixed it at \$1.59 per square yard?

A. Yes.

Q. How many square yards were paid for?

A. Approximately 11,600 yards. I have not the exact figures here, but it is very close to that.

Q. You had a number of other paving contracts during that same year. What was the average price paid for concrete pavement?

A. I could hardly tell you. The difficulty in comparing, of course, is that this was a little job, while the average job would be for six to twelve miles in length.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Would the unit cost be higher on only 1,400 feet long than it would be on one 12 miles long?

A. Oh yes. He has to have all the equipment on the small job that he would have required on the big job. I cannot give you the average price, but here are three jobs. There is the Thamesville-Dresden job—

Q. How long was that?

A. 4.7 miles.

Q. What price was paid?

A. \$1.31. Petrolia north, seven miles, \$1.22. Tilbury west, \$1.21; that was eight miles long. But they would not have any more equipment on one of those jobs than he would have on this little job of less than a mile—I think it was about three-quarters of a mile long, but it is quite wide.

MR. HIPEL: Who did the engineering work on that job?

A. We did.

Q. Did Frank Barber have anything to do with this job?

A. No, they were off the job as soon as they finished with the bridge.

Q. And you would have your own inspectors on that job?

A. Yes.

Q. Who were they?

A. I could not say; someone from our Stratford offices; but I can find out, if you think it is necessary.

Q. I do not think it is necessary. Was this contractor required to furnish a maintenance bond for this pavement?

A. No. As I say, we have not required a maintenance bond for the last ten or twelve years.

Q. A number of years ago you used to require a maintenance bond, for at least three years, didn't you?

A. No, it was for one year.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Q. How long ago was that?

A. Away back in Mr. Biggs' days.

MR. NIXON: You had a maintenance bond on the road going past Mr. Biggs' place?

A. Yes.

Q. And that was for three years?

A. It may have been for three years. We had it for one year.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Why did you cut out the maintenance bonds?

A. We found that we had to pay for the maintenance bond, but it very rarely was called upon; and, as a consequence, we were paying for something for which we received no benefit.

Q. Rigid inspection did away with the necessity for that requirement?

A. Yes. The Department inspects every pound of material which goes into a job and supervises the construction and directs the contractor what to do. It seems to be a ridiculous thing to make a contract, then to have such close supervision, and then make the contractor supply a maintenance bond on a job which has been entered into and entirely done under our supervision, and therefore we dropped the maintenance bond.

MR. HIPEL: There was no maintenance bond required?

A. No.

Q. That was dropped in later years?

A. It is quite a while.

MR. HIPEL: I distinctly remember that a contractor in my county had to give a maintenance bond.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: And he went broke, didn't he?

MR. HIPEL: Several of them went broke.

WITNESS: I recommended that the Government should discontinue the requirement of maintenance bonds. My thought was that we used to pay for the maintenance bond on work where it did not mean anything. It was only a dead loss.

Q. Who paid for the repairing of these approaches that same year?

A. I do not remember any repairs which were made.

Q. The Standard Paving Company, at Kitchener, repaired the approaches, and, I think, instead of them being paid directly, you paid the Dufferin Construction Company?

A. No, there was no repair there. On the last section, of some 100 feet at the approach to the bridge, we thought it was not advisable to put concrete; but we consolidated it and put on an amiesite pavement. There was no repairing there.

Q. Sometime after the bridge was completed there was amiesite put on there to bring it up to the bridge?

A. There was no concrete pavement put on for upwards of 100 feet from the bridge. That was just a thin amiesite job, because we expected a settlement there. Eventually that 100 feet will be paved. But, you see, it is only a little top on there; I do not think it is more than two or three inches thick; and as that grade settles we will add to that each year.

Q. In other words, you assume the responsibility for the contractor's work settling?

HON. MR. MACAULAY: No, we did not ask the contractor to do any work on that 100 feet; but we assumed that ourselves.

MR. HIPEL: That is what I say?

A. Yes. We stay back—

MR. NIXON: You assumed that anyway?

A. We stay back now a matter of 50 feet or so from any bridge.

MR. HIPEL: On that bridge approaching Brantford, you had to do work this year?

A. The bridge over the C.N.R., if we had gone ahead and done the paving, it would have settled; but we stayed back and put a little amiesite top on to allow for a settlement.

MR. NIXON: I was thinking of one a little further on.

WITNESS: Yes, that settled; and that is not always possible.

MR. HIPEL: Was this pavement reinforced?

A. Yes, entirely.

Q. What price did you have to pay this contractor for laying that reinforcing?

A. Two cents per square yard.

Q. Is that not more than the usual price?

A. No.

Q. I understand that some of your contractors are only being paid half a cent a square yard?

A. That might apply now, because we are getting close to the bottom; but I do not think that was an unusual price at that time.

Q. What was the total length of this pavement?

A. I would have to guess at that, but I think it was a trifle over three-quarters of a mile.

Q. Between three-quarters and four-fifths of a mile?

A. Yes.

Q. In the answer to the question on Votes and Proceedings, which you gave under date March 8th, the paving of this three-quarters of a mile amounted to \$36,480.78?

A. I have here the method, showing how that was computed.

Q. You would put that in?

A. Yes. As a matter of fact the paving itself cost \$17,800, but there were a number of other items entering into that work.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: And as usual, we bought all the materials?

A. Yes, we bought the cement and steel; and our engineering expenses were \$1,700.00.

Q. This is a copy of the account as furnished to the county?

A. Yes. This is the way I got it for an answer to that question. (Appendix C.)

MR. HIPEL: Were any contractors refused permission to tender on that pavement job?

A. No, I do not remember any contractor ever bringing it to our attention.

Q. Why were not Waterloo County contractors, who are actually taxpayers to that construction work, not given an opportunity to bid on that paving?

A. My thought was that we would be rather in real trouble if we had three contractors on that job. We had one twelve hundred feet away, and another one on the approach; and with another contractor on top of those, we would have had a pretty congested time.

Q. As a matter of fact none of our contractors in Kitchener, Waterloo or Guelph were given any opportunity to bid on this paving?

A. No.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: As a matter of fact none were refused?

A. No.

MR. HIPEL: As a matter of fact I could subpoena a witness, if necessary, to refute that. For instance, the company that laid the pavement from Kitchener to Guelph, that laid the balance of the pavement.

A. Were they refused an opportunity to tender?

Q. Yes.

A. This is the first I have ever heard of it. They certainly never came to me, and I do not believe they ever came to the Minister. I am surprised to hear that. Who said that? Walter?

Q. The young man.

A. Well, this is the first I ever heard of that. I am surprised if that is the case; I never heard of it before.

Q. As a matter of fact, they were not given an opportunity to tender. There was no advertisement or anything else. Now, you compiled some figures here yesterday. That is the unit prices that were submitted on plans A, B, C, D and E, and these figures were not taken on the lowest tender?

A. No, there is not much difference between the lowest and the second tender.

Q. They were taken from the tender of a construction company who is reliable and whom you would have been ready to recommend?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, summing this thing up: On their bids are, for instance: Excavation, 729 cubic yards. The A price was \$1.85 a yard; and the E price was \$2.00 a yard. That is the price paid on E?

A. Yes.

Q. Or, in other words, a difference of 15 cents a yard?

A. Yes.

Q. On 729 cubic yards it would make \$36.45, which is not a big item. But, on the sheet piling on A you had a price of 33 cents; and the price paid on E was 80 cents—that was either on a lineal or a square-foot basis?

A. Square feet.

Q. That sheet piling, from the original design A, was considerably increased, so that you paid on the basis of 12,804 square feet; and you paid the E price, according to your figures, of 80 cents; which made a difference of 47 cents a square foot for driving the piling furnished by the Department. That is the steel piling. Making a total difference of driving the steel piling of \$6,017.88?

A. When this bridge was under consideration, there were only A, B, C and D; E was not developed; and the A bid was all on the 24-foot structure, and the quantities were all on the 24-foot structure; whereas, of course, we built a 30-foot structure under E.

Q. But so far as the sheet piling, that is a protection around the piers, instead of being a lower amount than the bid, in E the amount was changed?

A. Yes, on account of the change in design.

Q. Which, naturally, should have reduced the price instead of increasing it. I am correct in saying that. There is your bid on A; B was the same, and I did not take the lowest bid but took the 33 cents; but the Department paid on the 80 cents basis; and that made a difference in the driving of the sheet piling around the piers—

A. Of course, at the time that was analyzed there were only 1,947 feet of sheet piling going in; so that it is pretty hard to compare A and what actually went in, because they were two different things.

Q. I want to be fair with you. You have been fair with the Committee. What I am leading up to is this: Had the Department, when they let the contract

D and then switched over to E, in the revision of the whole thing—my contention is that the Prime Minister, who was the Minister of Highways then, should have reviewed all the conditions, which no doubt he did, and then have gone out into the open and said, Here, we are going to throw this matter open for public bids. I am comparing the unit prices tabled on the original plan, and those paid under E.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: You are only comparing one.

MR. HIPEL: No, I am going through the list.

Q. On the footing in price on A you had a bid of \$8.65; the price on E which was built, your price was \$12.00?

A. Yes.

Q. And in your footings you had 745.5 yards, a difference of \$3.35 a yard, making a difference in your E price of \$2,497.42?

A. Which one are you comparing now? Is it A again?

Q. Yes.

A. There were 1,642 cubic yards originally; and in the final there were 754 cubic yards. That is a difference in our favour. The price for the 754 cubic yards at \$12.00 as against 1,646 cubic yards at 3.35.

Q. If the Minister of Highways had asked for new bids on the whole arrangement, his bids would have been more or less in proportion to the A bids?

HON. MR. MACAULAY: You have taken up the sheet piling and said it cost more; now you are taking up the footings; and you jump from the unit to the gross price. The footings under E were cheaper than under A?

A. Yes, they were.

MR. HIPEL: On this last concrete, you had 1,646—that was your estimate on A?

A. Yes.

Q. And on E you had 754 cubic yards?

A. Yes.

Q. But your price on E was considerably higher than on A?

A. Yes, but even at that, if you take the two and multiply them out, I think you will find what was the fact. I again say that what you have to do, in order to make a comparison such as you are suggesting, would be to bring A all up to the 30-foot structure. That would be the only fair way in which to compare those.

Q. The point I am trying to make now is this, that if the Department had asked for tenders on the revised plans, they would have received tenders on a basis almost like the unit prices and they would have saved considerable money. So far as the quantity is concerned, it varies back and forth.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: That is an engineering question which Mr. Smith can answer.

WITNESS: The only way to do that would be as I have suggested. You see, you are comparing A, which is a 24-foot structure, with E, which is a 30-foot structure, and with a six-foot sidewalk. So many different conditions come in that you have to really analyze them, taking them both on the same basis.

MR. HIPEL: I am not saying that your design E cost that much more than the original design A, but what I am saying is that your unit prices on E in every case were much higher than your other unit prices—I am correct in saying that?

A. That again requires an analysis of the two structures. Take, for instance, the form work which was necessary for one, in comparison with the other. All those things have to be considered, the difference in steel and false work. They are two such distinct designs that it is difficult to make an analysis here.

Q. Your price on superstructure on plan A, you had a unit price of \$26.50; and on plan E, your unit price was \$39.50, a difference of—

A. I do not think that fifty should be on there. However that would be only fifty cents.

Q. You had a price on E which you paid, of \$39.00?

HON. MR. MACAULAY: What was the difference in the quantity?

MR. HIPEL: In A your estimate was 1,350 yards, and in E it was 1,302 cubic yards.

WITNESS: Again you have the two different structures, one dealing with a 24-foot structure with a 5½-foot sidewalk, and the other, which you are comparing, with a 30-foot structure and six-foot sidewalk. That varies the quantities.

Q. Now, there were 1,302 cubic yards, with a difference there of \$12.50 or \$12.00, or a difference in the two unit prices in the analysis of \$16,275.00. And then next we have your A price on the handrail at \$3.50; and your E price was \$6.00; a difference of \$2.50, making a total difference of \$2,083.75; or in other words the difference between your unit prices in E was a total difference of over \$27,000.00; plus the difference in the grading price, and no tenders on the pavement. So, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister, who was Minister of Highways at that time, in view of the figures which I have submitted here which have been given us by the Department, should have at least asked for open bids on type E construction

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you through, Mr. Hipel?

MR. HIPEL: Unless somebody else wishes to ask some questions of the witness

MR. NIXON: When you determined on a plan and changed that, then it is not your policy to call for new tenders?

A. The tender permits us to change the plan around as we like.

Q. But there comes a time when you finally determine what you are going to have?

A. Yes.

Q. Then you do not follow the practice of submitting that again to open tender?

A. In this particular case, we did not.

WITNESS: I understand what Mr. Hipel is doing, and I understand his difficulties; while he is taking one and contrasting it over against the other, it would not look like that on the final analysis

HON. MR. MACAULAY: What is your own analysis?

A. I could not tell you now. I have never taken it as comparing E, the finished article, with the extra width of floor, and the extra width of sidewalk. I have analysed it itself.

Q. When you came down to selecting the type on which to do the job, you must have prepared some figures for yourself and the Minister?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you given a free hand, as Deputy Minister, to select the types and the contracts in respect to these bridges?

A. I am, yes.

MR. NIXON: But you have not the final say?

A. Well, my recommendations always carry, and therefore we have gotten by with it, with Mr. Macaulay.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: On the technical engineering details of specifications, in connection with bridges you and your staff prepare recommendations?

A. Yes.

Q. And they have been accepted by the Minister?

A. Yes.

Q. In this case, when you have decided on what type of bridge you are going to build here, you would have first to make up your own mind what was the proper thing to do?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you explain to the Committee how you made up your mind to go on with this particular type?

A. In the first analysis my own impression was—and as a matter of fact it was supported by figures as well; we had one analysis, and Barber had an analysis, and we had several other engineers all giving their own opinions on it; but in the final analysis D was the cheapest job.

Q. Mr. Hipel was trying to show that A was the cheapest job?

A. Oh no, at that time, with the exception of piling, which had not been provided for on any of the jobs—

Q. Then you can take it out, and let us have an analysis as you make it up?

MR. HIPEL: Might I make a statement? Perhaps you misunderstood me, as to this final analysis. I did not make the statement that the plan A was so much cheaper than plan D, but what I did say or wished to convey to you and the Committee is that had the Department called for tenders on plan E, similar in construction in piers and so on—if they had called for tenders or used the unit construction on A, that the construction costs would have been so much cheaper.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: Mr. Smith does not agree with that.

WITNESS: That would be a matter of the analysis. I, of course, favoured the beam type, while the D type was the cheapest, in the final analysis. I was always in favour of the beam type.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: But in recommending to the Minister as to which could be constructed the cheapest, you came to the conclusion that D was cheaper than A?

A. Yes, sir, there is no doubt about that.

Q. Can you give us something here to file which will show that?

A. Here are the analyses of the four designs.

Q. I would like to put those in, covering A, B, C and D.

WITNESS: Mr. Hipel finally went into a comparison between A and E.

Q. These are all on the 24-foot basis?

A. Yes, without any piling.

Q. If they were on the same proportion on the 24-foot basis, they would probably be the same on the 30-foot basis?

A. No. As a matter of fact in D, it would have been on a cheaper basis. In E, so far as the piling was concerned, it would not have been much different.

Q. If D was cheaper than A—

A. That is the analysis on the original bids which were put in.

Q. Under your analysis, then, the contract which you let was let on the project which you say was the cheapest?

A. Yes, but I did not like the design.

MR. HIPEL: But that was not carried out.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: But there was no change in the prices, and Mr. Smith said he thought that they were fair prices?

A. I thought that they were fair.

Q. I think we have given Mr. Hipel all the information which is on our files, and there is no dispute between us as to the price, as to the correspondence, the tenders or anything else. But I would like to ask you, Mr. Smith, as to the engagement of Mr. Barber as consulting engineer on this job. You say there was one other bridge on which a consulting engineer was brought in?

A. There was the Fergus job.

Q. Was there any particular reason on this Grand River, in this county, why it was in your opinion desirable to have a check-up by an outside man?

A. It was a very treacherous river on which conditions were very bad. There was the failure of the Canadian National Railway bridge, and the failure of the other bridge about five miles down the river; and there was our own bridge which was badly damaged.

Q. And what do you say as to the benefits to be derived occasionally by bringing in an outside engineer in order to check up on the highly esteemed officials of your department?

A. I do not know that the officials like it very well, but I know that it does a lot of good to bring in a consulting engineer occasionally.

MR. HIPEL: The only objection that I did make was that this man, Mr. Barber, was more or less an employee of the Dufferin Paving & Crushed Stone Company, and that the Department turned around and put in him charge.

WITNESS: I had in mind another case—

HON. MR. MACAULAY: At the Cockshutt Bridge, did they have a consulting engineer?

A. Yes.

Q. And then also Mr. Barber prepared the plans for the contractor who was successful in getting it. Was it anything unusual in doing that?

A. Oh no, any of the firms could have done that.

Q. You gave the opportunity to any of the tenderers to have designs prepared and submit prices on them?

A. Oh yes.

Q. Then as to the pavement, Mr. Hipel suggests you might have had in mind when you did call for tenders, when building the bridge, that you might have dealt with the pavement then?

A. Well, we did not know that we were going to have the subway. We did not get the approval of the Dominion Railway Board for that subway for some considerable time after that. Knowing that we were not likely to get the subway—the Dominion Railway Board had been contributing towards subways to a considerable extent, and their fund for that purpose, we had been told, was exhausted; but I thought possibly there might be still a little in the pot, and I went down to Ottawa and got their engineer and took him over the proposition, and showed him the bridge that we were building then, and drew his attention to the need for the subway. Finally they agreed verbally, and subsequently by Order. Without that, we would not have done the whole thing.

Then we had the subway constructed—under a subway there is always a mess, if you leave a subway unpaved. As a matter of fact, Mr. Nixon has one right at his own doorway. My own idea was that the pavement ought to be completed at the time. It makes the road otherwise impassable in the spring. Here, the Woolwich Township wanted the old bridge, and we needed the stone for the rip-rap; and my recommendation was that we should do it all at once.

Q. You had not any thought of helping anybody?

A. No, my whole thought was to eliminate any detour the next year; because it would have involved a considerable detour.

Q. Was it your suggestion or the suggestion of Mr. Henry?

A. It was my suggestion that we should get the paving done by the Dufferin Company.

Q. Then it was up to you to fix a price?

A. When the Dufferin Company bid on this job, they bid \$1.85 cents, but Mr. Smith, the Chief Engineer, and I studied it and came to the conclusion that the contractor could do it for \$1.59; and for that reason that price was paid.

Q. Then you have given Mr. Hipel three other jobs ranging up to seven miles. Having regard to the price paid in these instances which he asked you about, that averaged about \$1.75 a yard, and having regard to that, do you say that the price of \$1.59 on this job was as cheap as they were?

A. Yes, my idea was that that price was fair. He had to bring on all the equipment which he would have had to have on a big job.

MR. HIPEL: I have not analysed it but I say that our local contractors were not given a chance to tender on that job.

HON. MR. MACAULAY: You never heard of anyone being wanting to tender?

A. No, and I would have opposed bringing in another contractor on that job. We had two contractors on it already, then.

Q. You wanted a complete job and wanted to keep the price down to what you thought was fair?

A. Yes, that was my analyses of the situation.

Q. To sum up, Mr. Hipel put in a statement showing that in his opinion this could have been done for \$27,000 cheaper. Your view is that on the bids that were received, E was constructed at the cheapest price that was submitted on those that were tendered upon to the Department?

A. Of course, as I said before, there was D.

Q. On the design which you did subsequently accept?

A. On the design finally accepted, I thought the price was fair.

A. And was lower than the other projects which you had considered, if you go back to the 24-foot basis of it to the statement prepared by you showing that D was the lowest cost?

A. Yes.

Q. But you had to consider the materials which you were going to supply?

A. Yes, certainly.

Q. You might have to supply \$10,000 less of cement and steel on one job, whereas the contractor's price might be more?

A. Yes, that is right.

Q. And your analysis was that the project D was cheaper than the others?

A. Yes.

Q. And the only change was that when the subway was built and you had to widen the roadway, you had to increase the quantities?

A. Yes, but there was no change in the cost of the labour.

Q. And no change in the unit prices?

A. No, none whatever. It was the change in the method of construction.

Witness released.

GEORGE HOGARTH, sworn. Examined by MR. NIXON:

Q. Mr. Hogarth, what is your business?

A. I am Deputy Minister of Public Works.

Q. And in that connection you have some responsibility over the furnishing of the Buildings?

A. Yes.

Q. You are in charge of that under the Minister?

A. In charge of the Parliament Buildings.

Q. Did you receive a copy of a summons to appear before this Committee and give evidence and bring all vouchers and records relating to an item of furniture from B. M. & T. Jenkins, \$650—you have them with you?

A. I have.

Q. What are the items?

A. The articles consist of three tables.

Q. What was the price of each one of the tables—were they the same, or were they in a lump sum?

A. It is invoiced to us at one price, Furniture \$650

Q. You have not separate prices on the different articles?

A. No, I have not.

Q. What date was this purchase?

A. In 1931; the invoice is dated September 9th, 1931.

Q. What date was that delivered at the Parliament Buildings?

A. Early in the year 1931.

Q. You have not the date of that?

A. It was early in 1931; I am not just sure of the date.

Q. January or February?

A. Either January or February, I think.

Q. On what date was the purchase actually made?

A. Prior to the date of the invoice; I would say late in August or early in September of 1931.

Q. Did you bring that up here yourself, or did Jenkins deliver it?

A. Jenkins delivered the furniture to the Parliament Buildings.

Q. And the cheque issued immediately, I presume? What date is on the cheque?

A. The invoice was sometime going through, and the cheque did not issue until sometime in December, 1931. Just a minute, for I may be wrong in that.

Q. Did you buy these articles yourself?

A. I made arrangements for the articles to be delivered at the Parliament Buildings. The selection of the articles was in the hands of myself and the Premier.

Q. You went and inspected them, did you?

A. I did.

Q. And agreed upon the price?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, on whose instructions did you go and make this purchase?

A. On the instructions of the Premier.

Q. This matter was discussed in the House, and I think was referred to as antique furniture. Is that a correct description of it?

A. The tables so referred to as antique furniture are of rosewood and mahogany; they are in the Speaker's reception room.

Q. Do you set yourself up as an authority on antique furniture?

A. I do not.

Q. How did you arrive at a fair price with Mr. Jenkins?

A. We viewed the tables, and we considered that the price at which he offered them to us was a fair price for the goods that we were receiving

Q. You say "we"—do you mean yourself or the Department or the Minister?

A. The Department. I got the invoice for it.

Q. The Premier did not enter into it?

A. No, sir, I got the invoice for it.

Q. Have you anyone in your department who is an authority on antique furniture?

A. No, sir.

Q. What does "antique" mean in this case?

A. These tables are possibly 50 to 75 years of age—

Q. Are they new?

A. Oh no.

Q. Where had they been used before?

A. I could not say. We bought them from Jenkins.

Q. This was not a case of providing work for unemployed labour in manufacturing them this year?

A. No.

Q. So that any furniture manufactured this year or last year, no matter of what type or design, could that still be called antique, or is there some age limit which determines that?

A. You could go out to-day and have those tables made and stained so that they would be called antiques, but they would be imitations.

Q. Just how many years old do tables have to be to be antiques?

A. I could not say that.

Q. You do not pretend to be an authority on that?

A. No,

Q. You yourself went and passed on them before the purchase was completed?

A. I saw the tables in our room here, yes.

Q. It must have been all finished before they got here, as far as furniture was concerned?

A. Oh no.

The Speaker's Reception Room is the one which is used a great deal for luncheons and dinners and for the reception of distinguished guests; and it is very sparsely and barely furnished, and always has been. There is very little furniture in it. The various Premiers have taken considerable interest in it to see that they were at least reasonably furnished.

Early in 1931 the Premier told me to get some furniture sent up into the room; and they sent some up to see how it would look. They sent a whole lot of it up, and we sent a lot of it back; and this is all that is left.

Q. The Speaker did not have anything to do with it?

A. No, not at all.

Q. Is there much antique furniture around this Building? What other rooms are furnished in this antique design?

A. I am no authority on this "antique"; but we have furniture in this Building which came from the old Parliament Buildings down on King Street which may be 70 or 80 years old. I do not know whether that would be classed as antique furniture or not. There may be antique and antique.

Q. I confess I know nothing about it and want to take this opportunity of informing myself.

A. This is good furniture.

Q. It is not worm eaten?

A. Oh no.

Q. This is the only room in the Parliament Buildings which is furnished with this rare old stuff?

A. Yes, this is our best reception room.

Q. Then the purchase was really looking toward carrying out the scheme of decoration of that room or furnishing of that room?

A. Yes, to make it reasonably attractive for the purpose for which it is used.

Q. You have not any special purchasing agent in your department?

A. No, I guess I am the purchasing agent.

Q. Did the Department advertise that they had requirements of this kind?

A. No, it did not.

Q. So that there were no tenders called for furnishings?

A. No.

Q. What is your policy in that regard? Is there any fixed sum placed from which you purchase off-hand and above which you advertise for tenders?

A. No, this was rather special furniture that every dealer in Toronto does not carry. In fact there might be only one dealer from whom you would want to purchase an article of this kind.

Q. But you do not know as a fact that there was only one?

A. No.

Q. There might have been others who would have liked to have got in on this deal?

A. No, we asked for some furniture and had it sent up on approval.

Q. And you did not ask for competitive bids?

A. No.

Q. The price, \$650.00 for these three tables, you recommended to the Minister, I presume?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Who is the Minister?

A. Dr. Montieth.

Q. And he approved of it?

A. No, I was dealing with the Premier. I spoke to my Minister about it, but as the Premier had wished this room put in proper condition, the voucher is signed by the Premier.

Q. And your own Minister's name does not appear on it?

A. No.

Q. Is not that irregular?

A. No, it is not.

Q. It is quite a frequent occurrence then?

A. I would not say frequent, but in this case it was a room in which the Premier was very much interested and the furniture was arranged for in accordance with his instructions.

Q. The Minister's name appears on the vouchers then for the recent furnishings of the Sultan's Palace in there?

A. I think that no Minister's name appears on the vouchers. The invoice is there and the goods are certified as having been received in accordance with the order, and on the outside I signed and certified it.

Q. So that the price was fair and just?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you want your own room furnished with that kind of stuff?

A. No, my rooms are not big enough. It is furniture suitable for the room in which it is located.

Q. But we got along without it before, did we not?

A. The furnishing of that room has been up for many years. The former Premier was interested in having it look suitable.

Q. There was furniture taken out of that room to make room for this new furniture being brought in?

A. We always distribute furniture taken out of a room to other rooms, where it can be used.

Q. This room you would not say was bare?

A. It has always been very sparsely furnished and the furniture which was there before was very old and was not suitable.

Q. But if it was very old, it must have been antique?

A. It was worn out, not antique.

Q. You do not pretend that this furniture is new?

A. Oh no.

Q. You do not know where else it was used or how often?

A. No, I could not say.

Q. It was suitable and was ushered into the Parliament Buildings?

A. Yes.

Q. Were there any special ceremonies?

A. No.

Q. I do not think there is anything else I want to ask, unless you want to volunteer any information to enlighten our minds?

A. No, there is nothing.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: It is the practice to go over the Buildings from time to time is it not?

A. Yes.

Q. And you say that that room is what is called the Reception Room, adjoining the dining-room?

A. It adjoins the dining-room of the Speaker's apartment.

Q. Where distinguished guests are entertained?

A. Very often.

Q. We have had the Prince of Wales and several others down there?

A. Yes.

MR. NIXON: Since this furniture went in?

A. No, on different occasions.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: Distinguished visitors of all kinds are entertained there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it is where the Speaker gives his formal dinners?

A. Yes.

Q. And it is the only Reception Room in the buildings?

A. Yes.

Q. And it has been used for that purpose?

A. For many years.

Q. Through all kinds of administrations?

A. Yes.

Q. And it has been neglected for a considerable number of years?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The walls were stained and the floors were in bad condition?

A. Yes.

Q. And that year you went over it?

A. Yes, we did.

Q. And refurnished it?

A. Yes.

Q. And attended to the decorations?

A. Yes.

Q. The hangings were restored?

A. We repaired them.

Q. And the walls were cleaned?

A. Yes.

Q. And the woodwork was gone over, and generally the room was put in better condition?

A. It was renovated.

Q. And it was badly in need of it, after a good many years of use?

A. Yes.

Q. That work was done by your own people?

A. The work of cleaning up the room and putting it into condition was done by our own staff.

Q. And when that was done it was recognized that the old golden oak furniture was out of place?

A. Yes, it was.

Q. And you were instructed to do something toward improving the appearance of the room?

A. Yes.

Q. And for that purpose, I understand, Jenkins sent over some furniture?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. What did it amount to?

A. The first delivery of furniture sent over three tables, one settee, two small chairs, one large chair, two medium arm chairs and one small settee.

Q. Did you get a bill of that?

A. We did.

Q. What did it amount to?

A. I do not remember; but it was something over \$1,200.00.

Q. And what did you do?

A. I sent the bill back.

Q. Turned it down?

A. Yes.

Q. And then what was the next step?

A. Another bill came in for somewhere around \$950 or \$1,000.

Q. For the same articles?

A. No, for a smaller number of articles.

Q. Some of the articles which had been sent were taken away, and a bill for around \$1,000 was sent?

A. Yes.

Q. What became of that?

A. I sent the bill back. I did not want to incur expense to that amount.

Q. Then subsequently it got down to these three tables?

A. Yes.

Q. Were they apparently necessary?

A. Yes.

Q. There was nothing of that kind there at all—nothing for decorations or flowers or anything of that sort?

A. No.

Q. Then these three tables eventually were retained?

A. Yes.

Q. And the price fixed at what—\$650.00.?

Q. And a bill for that amount was rendered?

A. Yes.

Q. And paid directly to Jenkins?

A. Yes.

Q. These three tables are a pair of two and then a single one?

A. Two side tables and one centre table.

Q. As you have told the Committee, they are made of mahogany and rosewood?

A. Yes.

Q. And possibly the interior may be of something else?

A. Yes.

Q. But the main part of them is mahogany and rosewood?

A. Yes.

Q. And there is a lot of very elaborate carving on them?

A. Yes, and very beautiful.

Q. And they are of considerable age?

A. I cannot say the age, but they are somewhere over 50 years old.

Q. Have you made inquiries as to what it would cost to reproduce them now, new?

A. Yes, we did. To secure those tables in Toronto, we could not replace them under \$650.00.

Q. It would cost as much as that to have them built new—as much as you paid for them?

A. Yes.

Q. And then you would have the question whether the local man could produce carving as fine as that?

A. Well, it is said that this carving is possibly carving which you might not be able to have produced here. It is very good work.

Q. But even if it were reproduced here by some of the craftsmen, they would cost as much as you paid for them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you say they are suitable for the purpose?

A. Yes.

Q. And modest and reasonable?

A. Yes.

Q. And you point out that this is the Reception Room for the Province of Ontario, and the only room in which prominent guests are received?

A. Yes.

Q. And it is a room immediately adjoining the dining-room in which formal lunches and teas take place?

A. Yes.

Q. So that you think that the transaction was reasonable and entirely proper?

A. Yes, sir.

HUGH P. RICKARD, sworn. Examined by MR. NIXON:

Q. Mr. Rickard, what is your work?

A. I am the General Manager of the B. M. & T. Jenkins, Limited.

Q. You received a summons to appear before this Committee and give evidence and to bring all vouchers and records relating to item: B. M. & T. Jenkins, Limited, furniture, \$650.00. You brought those with you?

A. Yes.

Q. This sale was put through you?

A. The sale started before I assumed my present position.

Q. Then who would be the proper official there who would have knowledge of this transaction?

A. The late Mr. Tom Jenkins.

Q. He is dead?

A. Yes.

Q. So that you have no knowledge of the early negotiations of this sale?

A. I have such knowledge as is supplied by our records; but not personally.

Q. On what date was this sale made?

A. February 9th, 1931—that is, if you can call it a sale at that time.

Q. Who came to your show rooms or your place of business in this connection?

A. I could not tell you.

Q. And no one there could tell?

A. I do not think so.

Q. You have heard the evidence as to what the articles were, and that is correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Three tables?

A. Yes.

Q. And not all of the same design?

A. No.

Q. And the price is correct?

A. The price is correct.

Q. Where did your firm get these articles?

A. They were brought in by one of Mr. Jenkins' customers.

Q. You would not care to say where from?

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: I have no objections to his saying. It was from one of the old families in this city. It is only as to whether you think it worth while to have their name mentioned.

MR. NIXON: That is all right.

Q. What price did you pay for them?

A. They came in on consignment. I may say that it is a common practice in our business, when people build a new house if you can sell them furniture for their new house and bring in their old furniture and sell it for them on a commission basis; and that was what was done in this case.

Q. You never actually bought this furniture outright—your own firm?

A. No, it was a purely commission transaction as far as we were concerned.

Q. So that this furniture is not new?

A. No.

Q. It has been used before?

A. Oh yes, many years.

Q. How many, have you any idea?

A. It was made, roughly, about 1850 or possibly a little earlier.

Q. And where was it made? Was it imported furniture?

A. I think it was made in the city of Toronto by Jacques & Hay.

Q. So then your firm just got notice to deliver certain furniture up to the Buildings, did it?

A. I cannot say that, sir. All I can say is that on February 10th the list of items mentioned by Mr. Hogarth was delivered to the Parliament Buildings here.

Q. And you have no knowledge of anyone coming down to your place of business and looking the things over and ordering them?

A. No, I was not associated with the firm at that time.

Q. And on what date did you get the order for delivering this furniture?

A. On February 9th, 1931.

Q. That was the first intimation that came to you?

A. Yes.

Q. And you delivered it forthwith?

A. The following day.

Q. Direct to the Parliament Buildings?

A. Yes.

Q. And whose name appears on the vouchers, the Deputy Minister? Have you the voucher there?

A. I have no voucher for the delivery. It was purely a personal transaction with the late Mr. Jenkins.

Q. Just by word of mouth—you have no signed order?

A. No, I have not.

Q. You took it in good faith and sent up the furniture?

A. Yes, and we will be very glad to do the same with you, sir.

Q. I do not know that you would be well advised in doing so. You are an authority on this antique business?

A. I believe I am supposed to be.

Q. Just what does this word mean—does it refer to age entirely?

A. The word “antique” is capable of different definitions.

Q. What would be your definition of it now?

A. I would not venture on a definition. The only technical definition I know of is one which is used in the United States for Customs purposes, where goods to be antiques must have been manufactured prior to the year 1830.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: This is only to escape duty?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If you buy an article in England and get a certificate from the dealer that it was manufactured before the year 1830, it escapes duty when it comes into the United States?

A. Yes.

MR. NIXON: So that the term does not refer entirely to the age of the article, but it refers to the design as well, does it?

A. No, it should refer entirely to the age, I think.

Q. Is there a name given to this design of furniture—such as “Queen Anne”?

A. No, it is known in the trade as Jacques & Hay.

MR. NIXON: I do not think I have any more questions to ask, Mr. Chairman.

By HON. MR. FINLAYSON:

Q. Jacques & Hay were the outstanding Canadian craftsmen, were they not?

A. Yes, sir.

A. And they had a position in Toronto, in their day, that was very peculiar, was it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. They had a lot of English craftsmen that they had brought out, and they were making furniture of a very high type?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it has a peculiar value now because it was made by Jacques & Hay?

A. Yes.

Q. You know these particular tables?

A. Yes.

Q. They are of rosewood and mahogany?

A. Yes.

Q. Largely rosewood?

A. The legs and framework are entirely in rosewood.

Q. And the carving is in rosewood?

A. Yes.

Q. Rosewood is the most valuable of woods?

A. At the time those tables were made it was sold in England at 12 shillings and six pence per pound.

Q. Sold by the pound?

A. Yes.

Q. It was extremely rare?

A. Yes, it has always been rare.

Q. And still is?

A. Yes.

Q. And lends itself to furniture and carving?

A. Yes, it is very heavy and hard to work.

Q. And the carving on these tables is very fine, not only faces but figures and fruit, standard designs?

A. Yes, with the very best examples of Jacques & Hay's work.

Q. Some of those urns are particularly fine?

A. Yes.

Q. And some of the faces are very fine?

A. Yes.

Q. And what do you say about the value?

A. Exceptionally good.

Q. What about the price?

A. Very reasonable.

Q. These articles came from one of the old houses in the Park, I believe?

A. Yes, they did.

Q. And as people moved into smaller houses, such furniture became rarer all the time?

A. Yes.

Q. And is suitable for a place such as this public Reception Room?

A. Yes.

Q. Those craftsmen that Jacques & Hay had at that period were such that there has never been a firm doing that work since?

A. No, sir.

Q. Could it be reproduced to-day?

A. The only man who was a craftsman capable of doing work as fine as that in Toronto died about six months ago.

Q. I have made inquiries and found that they would not attempt to do it at these prices?

A. No, they could not. They could not get the wood.

Q. So that these tables are in a peculiar position?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are suitable for that room?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the price was moderate?

A. Yes.

Q. All you got out of it was a commission?

A. A straight commission. Actually, we made nothing out of it when transportation was figured.

Q. And you sent up a much larger selection, which you had to take back.

A. Yes.

Q. You are familiar with the Jenkins dealings?

A. Oh yes.

Q. But the books are perfectly proper?

A. Perfectly proper.

Q. And it was delivered here directly?

A. It was delivered here directly.

Q. There was no commission for anybody except, as you say, your own firm, who you say barely got out from it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it was good value?

A. Yes, sir, it was good value.

HON. MR. FINLAYSON: That is all, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else to come before this Committee?

MR. NIXON: No, I do not wish to press the other motion which I mentioned. I am quite satisfied.

AN HON. MEMBER: I move that the Committee adjourn *sine die*.

THE CHAIRMAN: Carried. The Committee is adjourned *sine die*.

.

APPENDIX "A"

Design "A"

Submitted Tender.....	\$56,424.90
Sheet Piling, 5,160 ft. at 93c.....	4,747.20
Cement, 4,036 bbls. at \$1.95.....	7,870.20
Reinforcing Steel, 256,000 lbs. at .028 cents.....	7,168.00
Steel Handrail, 17,100 lbs., at 10 cents.....	1,710.00
Wind bracing.....	1,000.00
Addition for placing footings below scour.....	3,453.05

\$82,373.35
Design "B"

Submitted Tender.....	\$50,179.00
47 Cu. yds. added (for correction) to substructure at \$12.00.....	564.00
Sheet piling, 5,490 sq. ft. at .92.....	5,050.80
Cement, 3,040 bbls. at \$1.95.....	5,928.00
Reinforcing Steel, 160,000 lbs. at .028.....	4,480.00
Floor domes, 1,560 at \$1.00.....	1,560.00
Extra depth of end piers to bring them to same elev. as "A".....	3,030.90
3-Foot extra fill for 1,073 ft. (since "B" has higher floor).....	4,869.60
Extra concrete in substructure to carry 196 cu. yds (under estimate)	1,434.00
Additions for placing footings below scour.....	3,774.00

\$80,870.30
Design "C"

Submitted Tender.....	\$62,958.15
Less for concrete handrail and extra width of sidewalk.....	7,069.80
Less in substructure to carry weight of above.....	689.00
Corrected for excavation, less.....	478.00
Plus erection of steel handrail.....	600.00

Bid.....	\$55,321.35
Sheet piling, 2,882 sq. ft. at 92 cents.....	2,651.44
Cement, 2,433 bbls. at \$1.95.....	4,744.35
Reinforcing steel, 260,000 lbs. at \$0.028.....	7,280.00
Steel handrail, 17,100 lbs. at 10 cents.....	1,710.00

\$71,767.14

Additions for placing footings below scour.....	2,489.30
---	----------

\$74,196.44
Design "D"

With ordinary concrete throughout

Submitted Tender.....	\$64,271.35
Less for concrete handrail and extra width of sidewalk.....	7,280.55
Less in substructure to carry weight of above.....	689.00
Correction for excavation, 150 cu. yds. at \$2.00.....	Less 300.00
Correction for concrete in superstructure, 17 cu. yds. at \$39.00.....	646.00
Add for erection of steel handrail.....	600.00

Bid.....	\$55,955.80
Sheet piling, 1,947 sq. ft. at 92 cents.....	1,791.24
Cement, 2,431 bbls. at \$1.95.....	4,740.45
Reinforcing steel, 324,000 lbs. at \$0.028.....	9,072.00
Steel handrail, 17,100 lbs. at 10 cents.....	1,710.00
	<hr/> \$73,269.49
Additions for placing footings below scour.....	738.85
	<hr/> \$74,008.34

APPENDIX "B"

Toronto, July 2nd, 1930

*Memo for Mr. R. M. Smith, Deputy Minister**Re Breslau Bridge, Contract 30-45*

I beg to submit a report on the plans prepared for this contract with a statement showing the results of the lowest bid received for each design.

Mr. Barber in his designs has used the Canadian Engineering Standards Association Specification. In respect to the working stresses that may be assumed or permitted under this specification the Department has not approved of the same. Mr. Barber was, however, instructed by me to use the New Ontario Railway Board Specifications which were prepared in collaboration with the Bridge Engineer for the City of Toronto and myself representing the Department. These specifications stipulate stresses in the concrete which your Departmental Engineer followed in preparing Designs "A" and "B" but which have been greatly exceeded in Designs "C" and "D."

I also beg to report that the contractors tendering on Designs "C" and "D" have apparently included concrete in the approach span superstructures as part of the substructure, instead of classing the same as part of the superstructure. I have, therefore, put the proper quantities in the respective proper classes and altered the tenders accordingly. I have done this because if a contract were awarded on one of these designs the Department would in all probability be called upon to make a settlement on the basis of the classification I have made.

In computing the quantity of cement required, I have used mixtures required by the said Railway Board Specification although I notice Mr. Barber suggests that he had the Minister's sanction to use a mixture based on the strength of the concrete ascertained by laboratory tests. I would hardly expect, however, that the Minister would grant this favour without technical advice from his own engineers or that he would wish to put a handicap on his engineers in favour of Mr. Barber.

In any event, our experience is that any money saved by saving cement by so-called highly scientific proportioning would be eaten up several times over by the extra cost of the necessary closer and higher-paid supervision and inspection involved.

I have also revised the tenders for the correct amount of excavation and sheet piling required in each case.

The results of the lowest tender in each case are now given:

Scheme "A"

Submitted Tender.....	\$51,192.00
D.P.H.O. Supplies:	
Sheet piling, 5,160 sq. ft. at 65 cents.....	3,354.00
Cement, 4,000 bbls. at \$1.90.....	7,600.00
Reinforcing steel, 128 tons at \$75.00.....	9,600.00
Steel handrail, 17,100 lbs. at 10 cents.....	1,710.00
Total.....	\$73,456.00

Scheme "B"

Submitted Tender.....	\$44,653.00
Sheet piling, 5,490 sq. ft. at 65 cents.....	3,568.50
Cement, 2,875 bbls. at \$1.90.....	5,462.50
Reinforcing steel, 80 tons at \$75.00.....	6,150.00
Floor domes, 1,560 at \$1.00.....	1,560.00
Total.....	\$61,394.50

Design "C"

Submitted Tender (with steel handrail).....	\$60,786.40
Sheet piling, 4,200 sq. ft. at 65 cents.....	2,730.00
Cement, 300 bbls. at \$1.90.....	5,700.00
Steel, 130 tons at \$75.00.....	9,750.00
Steel, handrail, 17,100 lbs. at 10 cents.....	1,710.00
Total.....	\$80,676.40

If the leaner cement ratio is to be permitted as suggested by Mr. Barber, the cost of the cement will be reduced by.....	1,558.00
Leaving a total of.....	\$79,118.40

Design "D"

I have not checked the tender received for Design "D," but it is evidently no cheaper than Design "C."

In conclusion, I beg to state that my Scheme "B" was developed mainly to get away from the conventional arch-truss type of architecture which I find is not in favour with the public and quite rightly so. Incidentally, Scheme "B" in addition to being pleasing to the eye is materially cheaper than any other design. In contrast to Schemes "A" and "B," please note the austere and plain designs "C" and "D" with the high-arch trusses made up of straight cast-arch rib members and spindly cross-struts.

Yours respectfully,

Bridge Engineer.

Toronto, May 14th, 1930

Memo for Mr. R. M. Smith:

Re Breslau Bridge

The Nelson River Construction Company have forwarded a letter accompanying their tender for this bridge, in which they state that in the design on which they have tendered there will be a considerable saving in the cement and piling to be supplied by the Department. I beg to advise you, therefore, that no attention need be taken of this statement as it cannot be substantiated.

Even if the tenders received on the competitive design were comparable to those received on the Department's design, I am of the opinion that the competitive design would hardly be acceptable to the Department.

Yours respectfully,

Bridge Engineer.

Toronto, December 18, 1930

Memorandum for Mr. A. A. Smith:

The Department has let to the Dufferin Construction Company the building of new highway bridge at Breslau. The revised plans covering this structure will be prepared by Messrs. Frank Barber & Company, Bridge Engineers.

In connection with the proposed subway on the C.N.R., would it not be advisable to get in touch with the C.N., asking them to call their work at the earliest convenience. A great deal of material that will be removed in the subway work could be used in the approach to bridge. Consequently we might save some money.

R. M. SMITH,
Deputy Minister.

ESTIMATE OF COST OF STRUCTURAL STEEL HANDRAIL
INCLUDING CONCRETE POSTS

Placing steel handrail, assumed bid.....	\$369.00
Concrete posts, 7.9 cu. yds. at \$38.00 x 3/2 at \$57.00.....	450.30
Supplied free to contractors, on siding:	
Structural steel, fabricated, with one shop coat of paint, 18,350	
lbs. at 10 cents.....	1,835.00
Cement in posts, 7.9 x 2.32 x 1.95.....	35.75
Steel in posts, 1,626 lbs. at 2.8 cents.....	45.53
	<hr/>
	\$2,735.58

May 31, 1930

HON. GEORGE S. HENRY,
Minister of Public Works and Highways,
Toronto.

Dear Mr. Henry:

I send you one additional item for the consideration of your engineers in addition to the sheets of comparison data sent you last week. This amounts to \$730.00 in favour of the Dufferin Construction Company.

At the time I sent you the other data, the cost of the steel handrail was estimated only. For comparative purposes I tried to keep the estimate of the steel handrail at least high enough and of the concrete handrail at least low enough, so that the difference in cost for which the Dufferin Construction Company could erect a steel handrail, with the lessened width of sidewalk, would be not overstated. I have now a firm price from the Dominion Bridge Company for the steel handrail specified, delivered at the siding at Breslau with one shop coat of paint, at 10 cents a pound. My former estimate was 15 cents a pound.

Referring to the above, please note that we estimate the weight of these railings at 18,350 pounds as against your engineers' estimate of 17,100 pounds. We have taken the higher figure as being least favourable to the Dufferin Construction Company. I enclose the details of my estimate of the cost of the steel rail, which I am sure you will find at least high enough; and therefore it does not unduly favour the Dufferin Construction Company as compared to their bid on a concrete handrail.

I am very willing, as mentioned to you, to send all our detail sheets relative to the above, in which case I respectfully ask for your engineers' estimate for comparison but if this is inconvenient to them and my sheets can be of any service, they shall be sent upon request. It has been usual, in these cases, for the engineers to agree first, or to agree as far as possible, before consideration by their superiors.

Yours very truly,

FRANK BARBER.

HON. GEORGE S. HENRY,
Minister, Public Works and Highways,
Toronto.

Dear Mr. Henry:

In regard to the specification for gauging of concrete, ours being for definite strengths, the Departments by quantities, I may say that it was principally because I wished to adopt strength specifications, not only for economy but for safety, that I asked you personally to allow me to use stronger concrete in my designs, which you graciously granted me offhand. I sincerely thank you for the compliment, which may be inferred, that you trusted me not to ask for

anything unreasonable. To vindicate your faith, I have letters in hand showing that in the strength used I am complying with regular practice.

I consider this an important point. Referring to specifications by proportions, Mr. R. B. Young says in a letter to me of April 16th, that the one-two-three mixture (as an example) specified as one of those for Scheme "A," that this precise mixture will vary in strength from 1,500 lbs. to 3,000 lbs. Mr. Young says: "because the aggregates of Ontario vary widely in their concrete making properties, I would say that even with careful supervision and close attention to water control, but assuming a consistency suitable for reinforced concrete, a variation in 28-day strength with 1: 2: 3 concrete from 1,500 to 3,000 lbs. per sq. in. might be expected, as between the best and the poorest aggregates that would pass the C.E.S.A. specifications." The C.E.S.A. specifications as to design (adopted for this bridge), on the other hand, refer to concrete according to the crushing strength at 28 days.

In the comparative costs of cement, a large item, I have estimated the quantities that would be required in our designs for considerably more than minimum strengths in order that at no point shall the trusses fall below the required strengths—for a truss is as strong as the weakest link. In the comparisons we have assumed the amount of cement required for our designs according to this letter of Mr. R. B. Young, head of the Hydro-Electric Laboratories and the principal authority on this. Even so, I have the temerity to differ with him to this extent, that the unit amounts of cement given in his letter are excessive—at least under very good inspection.

Strictly by the Dufferin Construction Company's bid on my sheets, they guarantee the strength of the concrete, and I am allowed to say that they will give this guarantee to obtain the required strength for the unit amounts of cement assumed in our comparison sheets; or more definitely as follows from Mr. R. B. Young's letter of April 16th:

Minimum Compressive Strength	Cement—bbls.
Lbs. per sq. in.	per cu. yd.
1,500	1.25
2,000	1.45
3,000	1.85
4,000	2.20

Quoting from Mr. Young's letter: "The quantities are designed for an actual strength 15 per cent. greater than the minimum specified; that is, the so-called 4,000-lb. concrete is actually designed to have a compressive strength of 4,600 lbs. This in accordance with the practice recommended both by the C.E.S.A. and the American Concrete Institute, and required by the City Architect of Toronto."

If the Department considers the bid as given, the amount of cement is limited to the above quantities, and also in the Department's specification for concrete by proportions the amount of cement is fixed, as it is one of the materials taken by proportions.

If, however, the Department wish to make laboratory tests upon the

materials as often as required and gauge them according to their varying properties by laboratory methods and have all measured, but the water, by weight, they can get the same results as my own experience shows can be got. If the cement were not supplied free to the contractors up to the very liberal amount estimated as required, they would take this trouble and save cement to their own gain; but if your inspectors will take this trouble, they may save on cement, without changing the strength, \$1,134.00, assuming they get the same results as I got for the Leaside piers, to take one example. Here, for 2,000 lbs. concrete, the tests never fell below 2,200 lbs. and never above 2,400 lbs. and we used 1.1 bbls. to the yard as against the amount estimated by Mr. Young above, and used in our comparison sheets, of 1.45 bbls.

Because it has such important information given in so short a space and is, in addition, so well written and interesting, I enclose a letter on these points from Mr. Disney, bridge engineer of the C.N.R.

Perhaps I should say that although I was asked to consult with Mr. Crealock on the Freeport Bridge, the question of the foundations for that bridge was never gone into with me. I considered this outside the range of my instruction, and the question was not broached by him. (Letter from Mr. Crealock, May 16, 1925; report of January 13, 1926, and letter of December 18, 1926, to Mr. Crealock.) The only bridge of my design the foundations of which have given way was Freeman's bridge for this county, repaired last year. This was on account of the great changes in the water course above the bridge throughout eighteen years. Both Mr. MacDougal, in the time when it was a wooden bridge, and I, foresaw this possibility and advised that the course of the stream be changed; for myself, when we built the bridge, afterwards when we built a long breakwater, and finally last year when we repaired it. On the last occasion this advice was taken and the bridge will now be forever safe if I can hold the dam across the old channel for another year or so until the new channel has become sufficiently widened to safely carry the spates.

You have been intimately connected, almost from the very first and up to the present, with the history of concrete truss bridges. The first such bridge in Canada the first after Considere invented the concrete truss (the approach to Sparkman Bridge in Nashville, which was mentioned at the time as such, was structurally different) was due to your strong support; afterwards you introduced these designs as regular practice in your Department, and it is not necessary here to stress the point by mentioning other bridges of this kind that you have supported in your long connection with the county. It seems to be just and fitting that you should be the first to introduce the real trussing of these bridges by web system of members all in tension, the one thing yet devised that will allow them to be built in the longer spans without the excessive weight in the arch chords that is otherwise necessary. See the enclosed print of a very long span of this type. Notice also the massiveness of the sway bracing. The arches, however, are not solid, the great dimensions being required because true trussing (making the "truss" of triangles, the only rigid form) could not be used without compression members, which would be much worse.

I need not point out that if any contractor's bid on Scheme "A" is lower than the Dufferin Construction Company's bid on either of our schemes, "C" or "D," on even terms, they are either much too low or the Dufferin Construction

Company is much too high; and the latter, I affirm, is not the case. It is much better for the bridge, costs being equal, to have it constructed by a contractor who is making a reasonable profit than by a contractor who could only build it according to specifications at a loss.

I can send you more information on Haydite, which applies to our two-span bridge especially, if you wish.

Will you please return Mr. Disney's letter and the print, when they have served your purpose?

Yours very truly,

Toronto, May 19th, 1930

HON. GEORGE S. HENRY,

Minister of Public Works and Highways,

Parliament Buildings, Queen's Park, Toronto, Ont.

Dear Mr. Henry:

Re Type "D" or Two-span Bridge

The reason I designed the two-span bridge which has little, if any, advantage in cost over the three-span if built in ordinary concrete, was because I believed you would be willing to consider the use of a lighter wight but equally strong concrete for it. Beyond this advantage (which is in the type of bridge) I can claim, of course, no right to its use in my design, only, my claim is that I have designed a bridge, where this concrete, more expensive per yard, can be used to great advantage in the total cost of the bridge, and have designed it mainly for this purpose.

It is likely indeed, that I am the only one to bring this concrete to your attention, but perhaps only because it has little advantage in cost of bridge over crushed stone concrete, except as used in my two-span bridge. There has been no case in Canada, I should think, since the long river span of the Peterborough Bridge in 1918, in which light-weight concrete can be used with such saving in cost as in this two-span design for Breslau. This is because of the long spans in a heavy material, and equally, the very slight bearing power of the soil which is taken to be about 2.8 tons, or about one-third that of hard clay. But in addition to this advantage, one pier on the island, instead of two, three, or four piers, some of them in the river, makes for safety.

I wrote you yesterday some notes on Haydite. The strength of the concrete is the strength of the mortar, and it is therefore as we should expect that concrete made with Haydite coarse aggregate and sand and cement mortar should in the tests be found equal in strength to that made with crushed stone or gravel aggregate. But in this case the contractors in bidding upon my design sheets have guaranteed the strength of the concrete, which is marked on the plans.

As to durability, burnt and fused clay or shale products such as Haydite have been found always equal in durability to concrete mortar itself. Furthermore, it is quite as impervious to water as similar concretes made with gravel concrete. Permeability, however, is not a factor in this case, as I propose to you to use Haydite only in the superstructure.

If you adopt Haydite, the weight of the structure will be decreased about one-third, which means a greatly reduced amount of steel and also less spread on the foundation, and consequently less concrete, cement and so forth in the piers. The single pier will still be considerably larger and stronger than in the Department's design "A" which has three piers.

You may adopt the Dufferin Construction Company's bid on this under your specifications. The prices in their bid merely applying to reduced quantities, but with an extra of \$2.00 a yard in the superstructure concrete for the extra cost of Haydite over gravel. This is all shown on the enclosed sheets. It will cost less also for about one-third less centering, but I have not considered this, but have taken their bid prices for concrete, only applying them to smaller quantities.

My comparisons are all with the Department's scheme "A." If scheme "B," however, is being considered I should like an opportunity of discussing it with you for a few minutes with comparisons of cost similar to those enclosed. I have not typed out the complete details of the items in the sheets enclosed, but will have them typed and sent to you when you wish it.

I make no excuse for contractors who bid too high, but I believe that the three contractors bidding upon our plans are little, if any too high to make a fair profit. There is a great difference in cost on equal bidding, as shown by the difference in quantities, between "A" and "C" or "D." Of course we think that the tenders around \$50,000.00 on scheme "A," are at least \$15,000.00 too low to allow for fair profit.

I hasten to add that in my judgment the Department's scheme "A" is an exceptionally good design, and that the superstructure is better than many similar superstructures that I have designed in past years. The excellence of the design of scheme "A" over former similar designs consists in my judgment principally in the square slab and the longer spans than in former bridges.

I was able to keep the quantities of material in the superstructure of my still longer spans to about the same as the Department's shorter spans, by trussing the bridge with web members, and the difficulty in doing this is that compression members in concrete where they are so long, are not a practical proposition. I was able to truss this bridge, however, by *tension members only*, this being the first of its kind. The dead load keeps the web members in such heavy tension that the shifting live loads cannot reverse the stresses.

If anything that I have done in bridge designing becomes more than locally known, it will be this device, upon which I am advised that I can get a basic patent. The principle equally applies to the longer span steel bridges and also to suspension bridges. There has never been a truss before devised with all-web members in tension.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) FRANK BARBER.

FB/B.

APPENDIX No. 2

Report and Proceedings of a Select Committee Appointed
by the Legislative Assembly to Consider a Matter
of Privilege

Being a Public Statement
Made by one Gordon Waldron, Esq., K.C., Reflecting on
the Honour of a Member of the Assembly

Session of 1933

Order of the House Appointing a Select Committee to Consider a Matter of Privilege

Tuesday, March 24th, 1933

On motion of Mr. Murphy (St. Patrick), seconded by Mr. Heighington,

That a Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into an alleged insult and libel upon a Member of this Assembly by one Gordon Waldron, Esq., K.C., of Toronto, contrary to Section 54 (1) A of The Legislative Assembly Act and bring in a report for such action by this Legislature as may be deemed expedient.

The motion of Mr. Murphy was, with the consent of the House, withdrawn.

With the consent of the House, on motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale),

Ordered, That a Select Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into and report to this House upon the matters hereinafter set forth, viz:—

The statement contained in the Toronto Daily Star in its issue of March 10th, that one Gordon Waldron, K.C., is reputed to have said and charged as follows:—

"If you ask me to state my convictions, I would say that he is being paid to promote that bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country, exposing himself, I think, to criminal prosecution."

The said statement and charge refer to a certain Bill introduced in the House by the Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick in the City of Toronto on March 6th, 1933, being Bill (No. 82), entitled "An Act to repeal The Optometry Act, 1931."

The said statement and charge by the said Gordon Waldron charge the said Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick with a contravention of Section 49 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

The said statement and charge being, unless substantiated, a contravention of Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act on the part of the said Gordon Waldron the matter is referred for investigation by the said Select Committee and for the said purpose the said Committee shall have full power and authority to call for persons, papers, and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth hereby command and compel the attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the said Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings or deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

The Select Committee to be composed as follows:—

Honourable Mr. McCrea (Chairman), Messrs. Hill, Richardson, Smith (Essex), Taylor, Tweed and Wilson (Windsor).

Report of the Select Committee Appointed to Consider a Matter of Privilege

SESSION OF 1933

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

Gentlemen:

The Select Committee of this House appointed to inquire into and report to this House upon the matters hereinafter set forth, viz.:—

The statement contained in the Toronto Daily Star in its issue of March 10th, that one Gordon Waldron, K.C., is reputed to have said and charged as follows:

“If you ask me to state my convictions, I would say that he is being paid to promote that Bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country, exposing himself, I think, to criminal prosecution;”

The said statement and charge refer to a certain Bill introduced in the House by the Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick in the City of Toronto on March 6th, 1933, being Bill (No. 82), entitled “An Act to repeal The Optometry Act, 1931”;

The said statement and charge by the said Gordon Waldron charge the said Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick with a contravention of Section 49 of The Legislative Assembly Act;

The said statement and charge being, unless substantiated, a contravention of Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act on the part of the said Gordon Waldron the matter is referred for investigation by the said Select Committee and for the said purpose the said Committee shall have full power and authority to call for persons, papers, and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth hereby command and compel the attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the said Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings or deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants,

begs leave to report as follows:—

1. The Select Committee has conducted an enquiry as directed on motion of Mr. Henry (York East), seconded by Mr. Price (Parkdale), and hereto attached is a copy of the proceedings including evidence and exhibits.

2. The Select Committee finds:—

(a) That during proceedings before the Optometry Board sitting and functioning under The Optometry Act, whereat certain persons were charged with a breach of the said Act and whereat the said Gordon Waldron, K.C., was Counsel for the Board, and the said Member for St. Patrick was Counsel defending five persons charged with infractions of the said Act, the said Gordon Waldron made the following statement, to wit:—

"If you ask me serious to state my serious conviction I would say that I think he is being paid to promote that Bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country and exposes himself to, I think, criminal prosecution,"

and that the said Gordon Waldron, K.C., upon examination before the Select Committee admitted that he made such a statement referring to the said Member for St. Patrick but claimed that the statement was made by him in Court and that upon the occasion of making it he was privileged.

(b) The law officers of the Crown advise that there was no right of privilege in making such statement so far as Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act is concerned, and that the said Gordon Waldron, K.C., was not, as he claims, privileged.

(c) That the Member for St. Patrick (E. J. Murphy) is a well-known Barrister, specializing in criminal law, and was formerly Assistant Crown Attorney for the City of Toronto and County of York.

(d) That he was retained by Mr. Hamilton Cassels to act as Counsel for certain defendants charged before the Optometry Board with having committed a breach or breaches of The Optometry Act for an agreed fee of \$200.00.

(e) That the Member for St. Patrick was wholly within his rights in accepting a fee or retainer and agreeing to defend the said persons charged, which he accordingly did on the 7th, 8th and 9th of March, 1933, and that in so doing he committed no breach of The Legislative Assembly Act.

(f) That there is no evidence of the payment of any fee for the promotion of the said Bill and Mr. Waldron admitted before the Committee that, outside of the said fee of \$200.00, he had no evidence to submit that the said Member for the Riding of St. Patrick was paid to promote the Bill.

(g) That Mr. Murphy was retained by Hamilton Cassels, on the 25th of February, 1933, that notice of the introduction of the Bill, being an Act to repeal The Optometry Act, 1931, was given on February 27th, 1933 (see Votes and Proceedings, No. 7), the Bill in question was introduced on the 6th of March but if passed was not to take effect until the first of January, 1934, and that the trial of the defendants for the offences complained of against The Optometry Act commenced on March 7th, 1933.

(h) Finally, that the statement or charge by Mr. Gordon Waldron, K.C., herein before set out has not been substantiated and that it constitutes an insult to the Member for St. Patrick under Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

April 11th, 1933.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly Appointed
to Consider a Matter of Privilege

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,

Friday, March 24th, 1933, 10.30 a.m.

Present: Hon. Charles McCrea, Chairman; Messrs. Hill, Richardson, Smith (Essex), Taylor, Tweed, Wilson (Windsor), Members of the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, perhaps we had better proceed even in the temporary absence of Mr. Smith (Essex).

The Assembly, on the 21st of March, passed a motion ordering that a Select Commission of this House be appointed to enquire into and report to this House upon the matter hereinafter set forth, namely:

"The statement contained in the Toronto Daily Star in its issue of March 10th, that one Gordon Waldron, K.C., is reputed to have said and charged as follows:—

"If you ask me to state my convictions, I would say that he is being paid to promote that bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country, exposing himself, I think, to criminal prosecution."

The said statement and charge refer to a certain Bill introduced in the House by the Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick in the City of Toronto on March 6th, 1933, being Bill (No. 82), entitled "An Act to repeal The Optometry Act, 1931."

The said statement and charge by the said Gordon Waldron charge the said Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick with a contravention of Section 49 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

The said statement and charge being, unless substantiated, a contravention of Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act on the part of the said Gordon Waldron the matter is referred for investigation by the said Select Committee and for the said purpose the said Committee shall have full power and authority to call for persons, papers, and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth hereby command and compel the attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the said Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings or deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

The Select Committee to be composed as follows: Honourable Mr. McCrea (Chairman), Messrs. Hill, Richardson, Smith (Essex), Taylor, Tweed and Wilson (Windsor)."

Now, Mr. Secretary, will you please call the roll of the Committee.

MR. HARVEY (Secretary) called the roll; all members responding.

THE CHAIRMAN: They are all present.

Gentlemen, this is an organization meeting of this Committee. We propose to proceed to deal with the matter referred to this Committee by the House. It will be in order this morning to determine the witnesses and persons we require to appear before us, to determine the matter submitted to us.

We should have a direction as to the persons required.

Mr. Murphy is here. Are there any persons other than Mr. Waldron, whom we should ask to appear at our next meeting?

MR. TWEED: I suppose that Mr. Waldron will be the only one who could give us any information on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then, the motion will be in order for subpoenaing Mr. Waldron, for his presence before this Committee. The next meeting of the Committee will be Tuesday morning next, at 10 o'clock. If somebody will make a motion that Mr. Gordon Waldron, K.C., be subpoenaed to appear before the meeting of this Committee at 10 o'clock next Tuesday morning, we shall see that the proper directions go to Mr. Waldron.

MR. TWEED: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WILSON (Windsor): I second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Tweed, seconded by Mr. Wilson (Windsor), that a subpoena be directed to be served upon Mr. Gordon Waldron, K.C., to appear before this Committee on Tuesday morning next, at this reception room, at 10 o'clock. What is your pleasure? (Carried unanimously.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other persons or papers or things which we require?

MR. RICHARDSON: Should Mr. Murphy be formally asked to attend, or shall we take it for granted that he will be here?

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be a matter for Mr. Murphy's own discretion. I assume he likely will be present. The matter referred to the Committee is to enquire into the statement of Mr. Waldron as appeared in the Toronto Daily Star.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, there will be certain persons necessary to establish the complaint.

MR. TWEED: Should not Mr. Murphy furnish us with those names of the persons, so that subpoenae may be issued for them?

THE CHAIRMAN: The matter is before the Committee as to the persons, papers and things which the Committee will require.

MR. MURPHY: If I might make a statement, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: The suggestion of Mr. Waldron is that this Ritholz Optical Company are the individuals who are interested in this Bill, and in regard to the matter before the Optometry Board, I was retained by Mr. Cassells, and possibly it would be a good idea to have Mr. Cassells here, and ask him to bring any books or papers in connection with this matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which Mr. Cassells is that?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Hamilton Cassells, Solicitor in the Hamilton Trust Building. Perhaps also a representative from the Ritholz Company. I think the gentleman's name is Brown; I do not know his initials.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is their address?

MR. MURPHY: Let him produce his books.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is their address?

MR. MURPHY: I do not know. We can find that out very easily.

MR. WILSON (Windsor): What is the procedure? It occurred to me that a good plan would be to have Mr. Murphy here, as a member, and Mr. Waldron here, and then we can determine better what our further procedure will be.

THE CHAIRMAN: The only thing is that the motion was referred to us on the 21st; the Session is getting on; this meeting will not be held until the 28th of March; these subpoenae of the necessary witnesses in order to place the facts before the Committee should be issued so that they may be here on that date, whatever other discussion we arrange at that time.

I should think we ought to have some representative of the Star, who is familiar with the news item.

MR. TWEED: The news item appeared in several papers. Would it not be well to have them all on hand?

MR. MURPHY: Another matter, Mr. Chairman; the stenographer at the meeting of the Optometry Board could be subpoenaed.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is his name?

MR. MURPHY: I don't know whether I have a transcript of the evidence or

not; I have a transcript of the evidence, but I do not know whether it contains the reporter's name.

MR. TWEED: If it is in order, Mr. Chairman, I would move that Mr. Murphy and Mr. Waldron be asked to submit a list of the witnesses whom they wish to have called so that the necessary subpoenas may be issued.

MR. SMITH (Essex): I would second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion by Mr. Tweed, seconded by Mr. Smith (Essex), that Mr. Murphy and Mr. Waldron be asked to submit a list of witnesses whom they wish called.

MR. MURPHY: I am stating all the witnesses which can be called. Mr. Waldron just made this statement; there is no witness he can call. I am prepared to dispose of the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: The list you have set forth to the Committee verbally are the ones who should be here, as far as you are concerned?

MR. MURPHY: Of course, as I say, the onus is upon Mr. Waldron—

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that.

MR. MURPHY: But I will not leave it to Mr. Waldron to discharge that onus properly; I am willing to do it myself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then we have all of the names, as far as you are concerned, whom you wish called?

MR. MURPHY: I have not the stenographer's name who prepared the transcript containing the statement made by Mr. Waldron up at the Optometry Board, but he should be here. All that happened was that the newspapers just got it from the stenographer.

MR. TWEED: This motion would leave it open so that you could add in other names within the next day or two, which may occur to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee has power to issue subpoenas, and we will be glad to call any others and have them brought here if it is decided they are necessary. I think we should have a reporter or some representative from the Star as to the item which appeared in the Star of March 10th.

MR. MURPHY: I would suggest that Major Lewis formally put in the proposed repeal of The Optometry Act, and the day I placed it on the order paper in his custody.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have those here.

MR. MURPHY: Just formal proof of it.

MR. TWEED: Other newspapers have been mentioned here besides the Star.

MR. RICHARDSON: The Star is mentioned in the motion, Mr. Tweed.

MR. MURPHY: A sufficient proof in libel is the actual presentation of the libel in itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else to bring before the Committee? We have issued directions for the subpoenaing of certain persons including Mr. Waldron, and the production of certain papers including the copy of the Toronto Daily Star of March 10th, to be brought before our next meeting on Tuesday morning.

MR. TWEED: I do not think the motion I made, seconded by Mr. Smith (Essex), that both Mr. Murphy and Mr. Waldron be requested to submit a list of their witnesses whom they wish to have called, has been dealt with.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Murphy takes the view, which is quite proper, that the onus here is upon Mr. Waldron who charges Mr. Murphy, a Member of this House, with such conduct as is an infringement of the Legislative Assembly Act. We are particularly concerned with having Mr. Waldron here in order that we may enquire into that charge.

Mr. Murphy has suggested the names of certain persons, which complies with your view, Mr. Tweed, as far as Mr. Murphy is concerned. Mr. Waldron will be subpoenaed, and if there are other parties he desires to have present, we will arrange to have them subpoenaed.

MR. SMITH (Essex): Will Mr. Waldron be put on his defence first, or will actual proof be submitted to the Committee that Mr. Waldron made this statement?

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be a matter—

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Cassells was there at the time. I was not present when the statement was made, if he disputes it.

MR. SMITH (Essex): Call the stenographer, and Mr. Cassells; that should be sufficient proof of the making of the statement. Apparently he never denied it.

MR. WILSON (Windsor): He may admit it.

MR. TWEED: Who will be asked to present the case first, Mr. Waldron or Mr. Murphy?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Waldron is the man who makes the charge against a Member of this House, and as a Committee, we have been named by the House to enquire really into the truth or falsity of this statement, as to whether Mr. Murphy, a Member of the House, is guilty of a breach of the Legislative Assembly Act. That is the point we are going to enquire into. That is the gravamen of the charge in Mr. Waldron's statement.

There being nothing further before the Committee, we stand adjourned until Tuesday morning, March 28th, at this place, at 10 o'clock.

Whereupon the further proceedings of this investigation adjourned until Tuesday, March 28th, 1933, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

SECOND SITTING

Tuesday, March 28th, 1933, 10.00 a.m.

Present: Hon. Charles McCrea, Chairman; Messrs. Hill, Richardson, Smith (Essex), Taylor, Tweed, Wilson (Windsor), members of the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been ordered by the House—

“That a Select Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into and report to this House upon the matters hereinafter set forth, viz.:—

“The statement contained in the Toronto Daily Star in its issue of March 10th, that one Gordon Waldron, K.C., is reputed to have said and charged as follows:—

“‘If you ask me to state my convictions, I would say that he is being paid to promote that bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country, exposing himself, I think, to criminal prosecution.’

“The said statement and charge refer to a certain Bill introduced in the House by the Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick in the City of Toronto on March 6th, 1933, being Bill (No. 82), entitled ‘An Act to repeal The Optometry Act, 1931’.

“The said statement and charge of the said Gordon Waldron charge the said Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick with a contravention of Section 49 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

“The said statement and charge being, unless substantiated, a contravention of Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act on the part of the said Gordon Waldron the matter is referred for investigation by the said Select Committee and for the said purpose the said Committee shall have full power and authority to call for persons, papers and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth hereby command and compel the attendants before the said Select Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the said Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings or deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

“The Select Committee to be composed as follows:—

“Honourable Mr. McCrea, Chairman; Messrs. Hill, Richardson, Smith (Essex), Taylor, Tweed and Wilson (Windsor).”

Gentlemen, you have heard the reference to this Committee by the Legislative Assembly. Witnesses are present and the charge involves, as the motion puts it, “Said statement and charge by the said Gordon Waldron charged the said Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick’s with contravention of the Legislative Assembly Act.”

I observe that Mr. Waldron is here and would ask Mr. Waldron to come

forward and be sworn and present such evidence before this Committee as he has to substantiate the charge which has been made.

MR. WALDRON: I thought that you had ordered another proceeding on the earlier meeting of the Committee. I understood that Mr. Murphy proposed to prove what he called the charge and to proceed as in the manner of a libel action, and then, having made a *prima facie* case, the burden should devolve upon me. That is what I have come prepared for. I have no witnesses here because I have had no witnesses summoned.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think you will agree that the reference to us sets forth the charge which has been made by you.

MR. WALDRON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I think this Committee is of the opinion that it would like to hear from you what you have to substantiate the charge, not only as it affects the Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick's but also the Legislative Assembly.

MR. WALDRON: Well, the charge is not proved here to begin with. In the second place, I have had no opportunity of calling witnesses. I am ready to go on, as was suggested by Mr. Murphy on Friday, I am ready to go on if he will prove his case.

THE CHAIRMAN: If who will prove?

MR. WALDRON: Mr. Murphy, that is what you proposed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Murphy is not running this case.

MR. WALDRON: I am not suggesting that he is.

THE CHAIRMAN: This Committee is asking you to present to it such information and such evidence as will place before it your reasons for the statement. I quite agree, if you wish, we will prove the publication, if that is what you mean?

MR. WALDRON: Well, I am not saying anything, I am in the hands of the Committee, but I came here following suggestions which were made on Friday last.

THE CHAIRMAN: By whom?

MR. WALDRON: Wait a moment. I refer to page 9 of the report.

"MR. MURPHY: A sufficient proof in libel is the actual presentation of the libel in itself.

"THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else to bring before the Committee? We have issued directions for the subpoenaing of certain persons, including Mr. Waldron, and the production of certain papers, including the copy of the Toronto Daily Star of March 10th, to be brought before our next meeting on Tuesday morning.

"MR. TWEED: I do not think the motion I made, seconded by Mr. Smith (Essex), that both Mr. Murphy and Mr. Waldron be requested to submit a list of their witnesses whom they wish to have called, has been dealt with.

"THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Murphy takes the view, which is quite proper, that the onus here is upon Mr. Waldron who charges Mr. Murphy, a Member of this House, with such conduct as is an infringement of The Legislative Assembly Act. We are particularly concerned with having Mr. Waldron here, in order that we may enquire into that charge.

"Mr. Murphy has suggested the names of certain persons, which complies with your view, Mr. Tweed, as far as Mr. Murphy is concerned. Mr. Waldron will be subpoenaed, and if there are other parties he desires to have present, we will arrange to have them subpoenaed."

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, so we will. Now, you are asking—

MR. WALDRON:

"MR. SMITH (Essex): Will Mr. Waldron be put on his defence first, or will actual proof be submitted to the Committee that Mr. Waldron made this statement.

"THE CHAIRMAN: That will be a matter—

"MR. MURPHY: Mr. Cassels was there at the time. I was not present when the statement was made, if he disputes it.

"MR. SMITH (Essex): Call the stenographer, and Mr. Cassels; that should be sufficient proof of the making of the statement. Apparently he never denied it.

"MR. WILSON (Windsor): He may admit it.

"MR. TWEED: Who will be asked to present the case first, Mr. Waldron or Mr. Murphy?

"THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Waldron is the man who makes the charge against a Member of this House, and as a Committee, we have been named by the House to enquire really into the truth or falsity of this statement, as to whether Mr. Murphy, a Member of this House, is guilty of a breach of The Legislative Assembly Act. That is the point we are going to enquire into. That is the gravamen of the charge in Mr. Waldron's statement."

Now, I submit nothing before the House, nothing proved.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are at this stage neither admitting nor denying charges as set forth for the Committee to enquire into?

MR. WALDRON: Yes, I put somebody on proof.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not prepared to admit that you made the statement contained in this reference?

MR. WALDRON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: You want formal proof of it?

MR. WALDRON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is not unreasonable, Mr. Waldron.

MR. WALDRON: You will find me very reasonable, sir. I wish I had a copy of the Telegram; I did not read the Star report and I do not know what it says.

THE CHAIRMAN: You were served with copy of reference to the Committee by the House?

MR. WALDRON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lewis presents to the Committee copy of The Toronto Daily Star, Friday, March 10th, 1933, containing that portion of the reference set forth in the reference, Votes and Proceedings, No. 25. Is Mr. Baldwin here?

MR. BALDWIN, a witness, being called and duly sworn, testifies as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Murphy, would you like to examine the witness, Mr. Baldwin?

MR. MURPHY: You are a Court Stenographer are you not?

A. Yes.

Q. And you took down the evidence in the case of Dunlop *et al.* before the Optometrists' Board, which sat on March 7th until March 10th, is that right?

A. Around those dates, yes.

Q. Have you a transcript of the evidence that was taken?

MR. WALDRON: March 6th, as a matter of fact.

MR. MURPHY: I beg your pardon, it was March 7th in this case.

Q. Have you a transcript of the argument between Mr. Cassels and Mr. Waldron after the evidence was concluded?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you got it with you?

A. Yes, sir, here it is.

Q. Just read pages 7 and 8?

MR. WALDRON: I am going to submit that the Committee ought to have the whole argument, in which this matter was raised first and developed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we will let Mr. Murphy examine the witness.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Waldron will have the right to put that in.

MR. MURPHY: I have no objection to the whole argument being read. I do not know what my learned friend refers to when he says "Whole argument."

MR. WALDRON: I mean copy of what he has in his hands.

MR. MURPHY: From page 1—well, read it.

Q. Is this a true copy of the stenographic notes that you took down?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. A true transcript of the same?

A. Yes, sir.

Witness reads:

"MR. WALDRON: Have you any other testimony?

"MR. CASSELS: No, for the reasons already explained on numerous occasions: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, you want to hear that explained further. I am through, unless the adjournment we ask for is granted so that I can go into the expert testimony.

"THE CHAIRMAN: How long do you want?

"MR. CASSELS: I would like an adjournment—

"MR. WALDRON: Before you decide on that question, I advise you that my friend has not produced here in the way of an affidavit sufficient ground for an adjournment. I advise you that he has had up till to-day twenty or twenty-one days of notice to prepare for this inquiry. If after hearing the testimony that has been given he is able to show the need of witnesses to prove something you want to hear him on that, but adjournments are not got in the practice of law on the mere assertion of counsel but upon proof satisfying the judicial officer that it is fair and that there is ground for an adjournment. Now as to what would be a ground for adjournment, my friend has not shown ground, in my view. What does he want to call witnesses for? If they are witnesses upon an irrelevant matter, if they are witnesses upon a matter that has been covered and his client has admitted then it is perfectly idle to adjourn the trial of the case. Now my friend has had ample time, he could have prepared, could have made out his case, could have had his affidavits now showing on what he is going to give evidence. What is there? He talks of giving evidence, of submitting something to the

experts. There is nothing in dispute among the experts; you only multiply testimony, some of it inapplicable maybe; but so far as advertising goes there is advertising, from the evidence of Hal. Brown; there is evidence of the complicity of these young men, some of it weak, you may regard all of it as weak; there is evidence of what was done; there is evidence of the young men's competence; there is the evidence that you have heard. You have heard them and heard the experts whom you rely on and you have read their orders, and there is the case. What is there in this case upon which you should spend more time by studying testimony?

"MR. CASSELS: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to reiterate what I have already said. Mr. Waldron stated at the outset of the case that if we deemed it necessary to produce further evidence as a result of testimony that was given that matter would be given consideration. Nothing was said at that time about our filing affidavits. I have renewed that application each day. There has been no possible chance while this case has been in progress to consult with experts and bring them here. Again I don't want to quarrel with my learned friend but he knows far better than I do that adjournments are frequently granted on the request of counsel without any affidavit being filed at all and that it is the exception rather than the rule to require an affidavit.

"MR. WALDRON: It is not, if I am—

"MR. CASSELS: Please, Mr. Waldron, allow me to have my say. I have had about a week, less than a week, in which to prepare my case, had no time in which to consult experts at all; I don't consider we have been given a fair opportunity of presenting our case, but if you do not see fit to grant my request for an adjournment I have nothing more to say.

"MR. WALDRON: I just wanted to say that my friend ought to tell you what is the nature of the testimony. I mean to what points it would be directed, so that you may judge whether it would have any value or any weight with you if we were to adjourn and permit its being presented. He owes that to you. We have the knowledge of everybody that a Bill is being presented to the Legislature by a Member of the Legislature who is of the counsel of the accused. I draw from that the conclusion that these accused, or the accused Brown, seeks to change the law of the Province in order to relieve him of responsibility for what he has done, that he seeks an adjournment for that purpose, so that your decision may be delayed until he has accomplished a change of the law. Now let my friend tell us here to what point he is going to direct his evidence.

"MR. CASSELS: I have already, I think, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, made my position clear. I very strongly object to the statement made by Mr. Waldron. I don't think he has any right whatsoever to make it, or do I think that any competent court would consider it a proper statement. He has no ground for suggesting that my clients are in any way interested in this legislation or in any way promoting it. His statement is absolutely unjustified.

"MR. JOHNSON: They are interested in opposing it and having the amendment.

"MR. CASSELS: He has no right whatever to say that they have anything to do with the promoting the legislation.

MR. WALDRON: There is the Bill, it is a Bill of Mr. Murphy's.

"MR. CASSELS: Please, Mr. Waldron. I consider that an absolutely improper statement, that my learned friend ought to know better in view of the long time that he has been practising at the bar, than to make it.

MR. WALDRON: I don't know anything of the kind.

"MR. CASSELS: And I think he would be called to account before any Court of Justice in this Province.

"MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Cassels, the meeting well know the Ritholz Company, how they have opposed, and the present amendment is proposed now to wipe out those 1931 amendments. Now why do the Ritholz people oppose it? They have got their own interests. Why do they want to repeal it? It is quite obvious to the Board.

"MR. CASSELS: The Ritholz people have nothing to do with opposing this thing; there are many other people who consider that the legislation is not just and proper legislation.

"MR. JOHNSON: Chiefly the Ritholz people.

"MR. CASSELS: You quarrel with that, Mr. Johnson; I quarrel with you.

"MR. JOHNSON: These were the only ones wanted to evade all responsibility.

MR. CASSELS: Please don't say that.

"MR. WALDRON: Well now—

"MR. CASSELS: May I ask to proceed without interruption, without being interrupted by Mr. Waldron?

"MR. WALDRON: These persons who are here before the Board now are interested we believe in the passage of that Bill. We have here a circular issued on the 7th March, that is the day before yesterday, signed by the Canadian Optical Association, per J. G. Tait—

"MR. CASSELS: I ask you, is Mr. Waldron going to be permitted to give evidence in this case?

"MR. WALDRON: We are on a motion now.

"MR. CASSELS: Is Mr. Waldron going to be permitted to give evidence in this case? Does the Chair rule that these are proper statements?

"A BOARD MEMBER: This literature was at every back door.

"MR. CASSELS: Does the Chair rule that these are proper statements of Mr. Waldron?

"THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

"MR. WALDRON:

" 'A Bill to repeal the 1931 amendments to The Optometry Act has been announced in the Legislature by Edward J. Murphy, M.P.P. Many optometrists have already written to Mr. Murphy commending him on his stand.'

"Mr. Murphy has been counsel on this trial. I consider it is the most scandalous thing I have ever heard.

"MR. CASSELS: I resent that again.

"MR. WALDRON: I will repeat, it is the most scandalous thing I have ever seen in over forty years' experience at the bar.

"MR. CASSELS: That again, Mr. Chairman, I take exception to. My learned friend has absolutely no right whatever to make a statement of that kind.

"MR. FORBES: The evidence is there.

"MR. CASSELS: The evidence is not there. Mr. Murphy has every right to appear to defend a client.

"MR. WALDRON: And he is in an equivocal position when he does it.

"MR. JOHNSON: In spite of the fact he is a Member of the Legislature he can come and defend a man and then go and put a Bill through to help him along?

"MR. CASSELS: He is not, as has been said here, promoting this thing to help the Ritholz Company.

"MR. JOHNSON: It would be if it went through.

"MR. CASSELS: Not at all. He is doing it from his own belief that the legislation is improper. It is Mr. Murphy's duty if he is retained as solicitor to appear and defend a client; it is his duty to do it.

"MR. JOHNSON: Against a Crown body?

"A BOARD MEMBER: Against his own Government. He is a Member of the Government.

"MR. CASSELS: That has nothing to do with the question of his duties in the Legislature; he is appearing here for the defendants in these cases, which it is his duty to do.

"A BOARD MEMBER: I never heard of that before unless a man was on his way out and knew he was on his way out.

"MR. CASSELS: What do you mean?

"BOARD MEMBER: Out with the Government.

"MR. CASSELS: I think you are misconceiving the duties of a solicitor. It is his duty to come here and defend his clients if he is retained to do so. Mr. Waldron won't quarrel with that statement.

"MR. WALDRON: Well now you ask me, I will say this, that the moment that I see a solicitor appearing here in the defence of these persons and in the midst of those efforts hurrying into the Legislature, where he is a Member, governed by the Independence of Parliament Act, his conduct becomes equivocal, his position is, for an honourable man, impossible, he exposes himself to suspicion that he is paid to promote that Bill, and if you ask me seriously—I have the kindest feeling for Mr. Murphy—if you ask me seriously to state my serious conviction I would say that I think he is being paid to promote that Bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country and exposes himself to, I think, criminal prosecution.

"MR. CASSELS: I have nothing more to say; if Mr. Waldron makes that statement then he is answerable for it. It is absolutely definite, it has been sworn to here that he is not being in any way remunerated. It has been sworn to here.

"MR. JOHNSON: He didn't swear it.

"MR. CASSELS: Another witness did.

"MR. JOHNSON: Oh well, he swore to a lot, yes.

"MR. CASSELS: And yet Mr. Waldron turns around and makes that statement without any justification whatsoever. I have nothing more to say.

"MR. WALDRON: Well then the evidence is, I should advise, closed, unless Mr. Cassels will state to you what it is that he wishes to give evidence on and what evidence he wishes to call.

"MR. CASSELS: I have already made my position clear, I think, and have nothing more to say, Mr. Chairman.

"MR. JOHNSON: I don't think you have made it quite clear, Mr. Cassels. The first day it was a lack of time and now it is expert witnesses you want and now, as far as the adjournment I haven't heard any logical reason why we should have an adjournment.

"MR. CASSELS: I tried to make myself clear at the outset.

"MR. JOHNSON: You did mention time, and now it is lack of witnesses.

"MR. CASSELS: No, no, lack of time still. We needn't quarrel here.

"MR. JOHNSON: We are advised you have had lots of time.

"MR. CASSELS: I have been forced in here this week within one week after the time we were first consulted.

"MR. WALDRON: Well now—

"MR. CASSELS: May I, please, Mr. Chairman, be permitted to state my case without interruption?

"MR. JOHNSON: Absolutely. Go ahead.

"MR. CASSELS: We were forced to proceed to trial just one week after the time we were—

"MR. WALDRON: Now that is not true. You were served on the 20th February and you were called here to appear on the 6th March, that is fourteen days.

"THE CHAIRMAN: Fourteen days.

"MR. WALDRON: And you have been here four days since, that is eighteen days.

"MR. CASSELS: You assured me I might state my case without interruption, Mr. Johnson. Now, will you, please?

"MR. JOHNSON: I will try to assure that, yes.

"MR. CASSELS: I didn't say something that was untrue and I very much resent Mr. Waldron making that statement. What I did say and still do is that we were consulted just a week before the case came on for hearing. I didn't say, nor did I imply, that these notices were not sent out on February 20th; I said we were consulted just a week before. Now Mr. Waldron says that is an untruth.

"MR. JOHNSON: I didn't understand that.

"MR. WALDRON: When you say 'we' I take you to be meaning your clients. If your clients waited around and didn't consult you until the day of the trial that is their lookout.

"THE CHAIRMAN: Have you your objections down that you want to register?

"MR. JOHNSON: They are all down.

"MR. WALDRON: And, leaving that, he has not yet given you any statement as to the point or points on which he wishes to give testimony.

"MR. CASSELS: Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to do that if I will be allowed to state my case without interruption from Mr. Waldron.

"THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

"MR. CASSELS: We did not have the proper time to prepare our case fairly for this trial. Now that preparation, as I have said, would have taken at least two weeks more than the time allowed. You have called expert witnesses to pass upon the competency or otherwise of certain optometrists; I should have

been given an opportunity to consider that matter with other independent optometrists and to have them here to give evidence. That is not a matter that can be gone into in a minute, or a day. This case should have taken two or three weeks to prepare properly, and as I pointed out before, the Board was making its investigation for a period of about six weeks beforehand. Mr. Johnson says I have given you two different reasons. They are one and the same, the question of proper preparation. Now that has been accorded us.

"MR. WALDRON: You don't know upon what topics you would give testimony, is that it?"

"MR. CASSELS: I have nothing more to say, Mr. Chairman

"MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied with that.

"THE CHAIRMAN: I am satisfied. We will now close the inquiry.

"7.45 p.m. inquiry concluded."

MR. MURPHY: Q. Did the newspapers, witness, ask you to read from your notes—is that where they got this report?

A. The same night one of the papers called me and asked for an account of what happened and I gave it to them over the phone. I do not think they published it. The next morning someone from the Telegram called me and asked for the same thing and I told them if they would send a man up I would give them copy. They did so and I guess they—

Q. You got that out—and article appeared in the paper you copied from your notes?

A. Yes.

By MR. WALDRON:

Q. The Mr. Johnson who was speaking here was a member of the Board?

A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Forbes?

A. He was also a member of the Board.

Q. And this inquiry, Mr. Murphy has just said, began on the 7th. Is that true?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall that Mr. Murphy and Mr. Cassels appeared on the 6th when the Tait case was taken up?

A. Yes.

Q. And remained all day?

A. They were there off and on—of course, I was busy.

Q. And do you remember that they had application for adjournment at the opening of the court?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you remember that they made it at other times during the subsequent days?

A. Yes, the application was renewed from time to time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Q. You say you gave that report to the Telegram?

A. Yes.

Q. That was the only paper?

A. I gave it to the Mail the same night over the phone, but I do not think they published it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have the members of the Committee any questions to ask? Is Eric Gibbs here?

ERIC GIBBS, sworn. Examined by THE CHAIRMAN.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Murphy, do you want to examine Mr. Gibbs?

MR. MURPHY: No, I do not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Q. Will you look at the Star of March 10th—

MR. WALDRON: I submit, Mr. Chairman, proof of the publication is nothing that affects me. If I spoke these words I spoke them at the time and it is recited in the evidence of the previous meeting and it does not matter whether published in the Star or Telegram.

THE CHAIRMAN: You take that position?

MR. WALDRON: Well, I suggest that. I am not bound by anything that the newspapers said or did or did not do.

MR. SMITH: I think it is very material, the extent to which this statement was published, I think it is very material. If it was made in a room with no one else there—perhaps one person, that is one thing, but if made in the presence of the press and broadcast throughout the country, that is another thing.

MR. WALDRON: It must be proved that I made it in the press.

MR. MURPHY: I imagine that is going to be done very shortly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Q. Are you a reporter for the Star?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you look at the issue of March 10th and an article "Thinks Murphy Paid to Introduce Bill. Gordon Waldron scores Acts of E. J. Murphy, M.P.P., in Optometry Inquiry." Who is the reporter wrote that article for the press?

A. I wrote that.

Q. And the information for it?

A. Was derived from the stenographic notes.

MR. TAYLOR: Q. These notes were taken by you?

A. Yes. Well, no, as a matter of fact neither paper was present at the hearing. Both papers waited until the night editions went out and the story was picked up next day by the Telegram reporter and I got that from the Telegram.

Q. You say was taken from the stenographic notes?

A. Well, that is my information that was the source of the information, as Mr. Baldwin stated.

Q. You did not get it?

A. Not directly.

MR. WALDRON: Q. And you did not consult me?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know that I had anything to do with the publication or knowing of it?

A. No, I don't.

MR. MURPHY: Q. You knew, witness, that that was made at a public hearing?

A. Yes, we were admitted to the hearing and we—I was there right through—well, practically through the whole time and we were admitted. The fact that we were not there had nothing to do with our exclusion.

Q. From time to time during the hearing of this Optometry Board you made reports to your papers and wrote articles?

A. Certainly. The press was not excluded.

MR. WALDRON: Q. It is the duty of the Optometry Board under the Act to hold public meetings?

A. As a matter of fact I asked you that question and your reply—you cited the hearing that was conducted, I think, into the dentistry profession and you stated that at that time you maintained that the hearing should have been open to the press and you made your point.

Q. No, it was the other way. I maintained in the presence of the present Attorney-General—

A. Oh yes, excuse me—

Q. At a dentist meeting similar to this that it was open and Mr. Hellmuth arrived there—I maintained they were open and Mr. Hellmuth arrived after and closed the doors?

A. The ultimate decision you explained to me that the press were admitted and privilege that applied to investigations of that kind was the same as privilege in ordinary court hearing.

Q. And I explained to you that the Act provides public hearing?

A. Yes.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to clear up one thing. The witness said that he got this information from certain stenographic notes but he has not said what stenographic notes or whose they were or how he got them. I would like to know whether they were stenographic notes made by previous witness.

THE WITNESS: The source of information—you see, neither paper was present and the source of information as I understand it, was the stenographic notes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Q. You mean, stenographic notes of Mr. Baldwin?

A. Yes. He stated how the information was released to the press.

MR. SMITH: Q. You said there was no reason why your paper or any of the rest of them could not be there?

A. No, we were there during—the only reason that we did not happen to be there at the time was that the night editions had gone and the stories had been written.

MR. WALDRON: Q. It was eight o'clock at night?

A. Yes.

MR. TWEED: Q. As a matter of fact you stated that you got the report from the Telegram reporter?

A. Yes, but the source of information in both cases was, as Mr. Baldwin states, merely the notes.

MR. TAYLOR: Q. That is, the Telegram reporter told you that?

A. Well, I was to'd that also by the people at the College of Optometry and by Mr. Baldwin himself. I mean, it was common knowledge.

MR. MURPHY: The article in the papers is word for word from Mr. Baldwin's notes?

A. Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we are at this stage of the proceedings, gentlemen, there has been proof of the publication and of its utterance by Mr. Waldron. Mr. Waldron asks to call some witnesses and to present his answer.

MR. WALDRON: Well, if that is the case against me I want to make a statement now, and if you go on after that in an enquiry against me, then I should present my witnesses.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we are directed to make inquiry into this. You asked at the start that a *prima facie* case should be made and it is the Committee's duty to inquire into all phases. If you have statements you would like to present by way of evidence to the Committee we will hear it, and I think probably if you want any witnesses called you had better give me the names.

MR. WALDRON: I will do that at once.

THE CHAIRMAN: And we will have them here shortly.

MR. WALDRON: I give you a list. (Hands list to Chairman.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you indicate, Mr. Waldron, the nature of the evidence these men can give. I do not mean to disclose your case but you have eight witnesses to be called here. The Committee is anxious to go into this inquiry fully and we would like to get an idea as to your position. Is your position that you made statements and that you made them in court proceeding and are therefore justifiable or do you deny having made them?

MR. WALDRON: No, I do not deny having made them. The report submitted by the witness, Mr. Baldwin, is I believe accurate, literally accurate, of what took place on that day at 8 o'clock at night. Now, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to do this: I will now make a statement in the nature of evidence and then if you wish to pursue me further, then I want to call witnesses, these witnesses, and I do not care, if you please, sir, I do not care to state what these witnesses are going to prove.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Then you would like to make your statement on oath?

MR. WALDRON: Yes.

GORDON WALDRON, K.C., sworn.

Examined:

I admit, as I have said, the words ascribed to me in the report of Mr. Baldwin. I say that these words were spoken in the course of an inquiry by the Board of Examiners in Optometry, a Board authorized by law to receive sworn testimony and to adjudicate upon and decide the rights of the parties. It was a court of justice within the authorities. Now, that is the admission that I make. Now, to that, I would add, that Mr. Murphy has not now made a case against me, using the language of lawyers, in a libel action, he has not proved an offence, he has not proved any infraction on my part of Section 54. Now, it is charged sir, in the resolution of the House, I think, and in the statements which have been subsequently made that I have broken clause *a* of Subsection 1 of Section 54. That is to say, I have assaulted, insulted or libelled Mr. Murphy. You will look at the section. I say I have done neither.

MR. SMITH: You do not consider the words spoken in any way an insult to Mr. Murphy?

MR. WALDRON: I do not, sir. Mr. Murphy has not proved his charge that in the language of Clause *a* of Subsection 1 of Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act I have assaulted, insulted or libelled him. He does not say that I have assaulted him and I say with the utmost confidence that I have neither insulted or libelled him. Libel is written defamation and I have not written a word. To insult means now and has always meant, in the law of parliamentary privilege to offend another in his presence—to offer another who stands before you an affront which may provoke at once a blow and a breach of the peace. The word is derived from the Latin *insilire*, to leap, spring, or jump in or on. And so, Shakespeare wrote accurately:

“Give me my knife, I will insult on him.”

The poet Daniel wrote:

“The lion being dead even hares insult.” (That is, leap upon.)

I think that no one having learned English at his mother's knee is unconscious that the word “insult” connotes that the offender and the offended must be in the presence of each other at the moment of offence. If you will refer to the 13th edition of May at p. 80, you will find the origin and the purpose of Clause *a*, Subsection 1 of Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act. The British House of Commons resolved in 1733 that it was a high infringement of the privilege of the House, a crime and misdemeanour to assault, insult or menace any Member of the House in his coming and going from the House or upon the account of his behaviour in Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, there is no suggestion in any part of the reference to us of any such assault, insult or libel. This is purely a question of inquiry:

“Ordered, That a Select Committee of the House be appointed to inquire into and report to this House upon the matters hereinafter set forth,

viz.: The statement contained in the Toronto Daily Star in its issue of March 10th that one Gordon Waldron, K.C., is reputed to have said and charged as follows:

"If you ask me to state my convictions I would say that he is being paid to promote that Bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country, exposing himself, I think, to criminal prosecution."

"The said statement and charge refer to a certain Bill introduced in the House by the Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick in the City of Toronto on March 6th, 1933, being Bill (No. 82) entitled 'An Act to repeal The Optometry Act, 1931.'

"The said statement and charge by the said Gordon Waldron charge the said Member for the Electoral Riding of St. Patrick with a contravention of Section 49 of The Legislative Assembly Act."

Now, our position is, Mr. Waldron, as a Committee of the House, that this matter referred to it, involving the dignity of the House inasmuch as the charge which has been made against a Member of it would be a contravention of The Legislative Assembly Act. Mr. Murphy is not here to prove anything. You are here to answer to this inquiry, so as to get at the facts, and having heard all of the evidence and the facts and representations to determine just whether you have offended the dignity of the House or whether this statement made by you is true and to make such report to the House as affects the whole matter, and inform the House as to whether there has been any contravention or whether on your part what you have said or done is a reflection.

MR. WALDRON: I cannot be tried, I submit, by the Legislature even except for an infraction of the law of the land or an infraction of the law of the Legislature. Now, if you are driving me, then I am making answer—I am saying in the first place, there is no evidence here to-day at this point when the prosecution has closed its case, there is no evidence against me of an infraction of the law of Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me clear that up. There is no prosecution in this case; it is a question of inquiry by its Committee on all facts surrounding this matter and for us to make report. There is no onus on Mr. Murphy to make any prosecution. You, if any charge has been made, are the man that has made the charge: "If you ask me to state my convictions, I would say that he (Mr. Murphy) is being paid to promote that Bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country, exposing himself, I think, to criminal prosecution."

Now, speaking as Chairman of this Committee, we want to have you present such facts to this Committee as you may have and we will give you the fullest latitude and liberty as may disclose to this Committee—

MR. WALDRON: If you will let me close my statement, I will then stand ready to assist the Committee and present the witnesses whom I have named. Let me go on, please.

The British House of Commons, I said, resolved in 1733 that it was a high

infringement of the privilege of the House, a crime and misdemeanour to assault, insult or menace any Member of the House in his coming and going from the House or upon the account of his behaviour in Parliament. The implications of that venerable precedent have not been changed by its incorporation into our Statutes, and if you look at page 154 of Bourinot, 3rd edition, you will find, referring to that rule of parliamentary privilege which has been laid down in 1733, under which I understood that I was being charged. It says on page 154:

“The assaulting, menacing or insulting of any Member in his coming to or going from the House, or upon account of his behaviour in Parliament, is a high infringement of the privileges of the House—in the words of the English resolution ‘a most outrageous and dangerous violation of the rights of Parliament and a high crime and misdemeanour’.”

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are labouring under a misconception. Mr. Murphy did have a motion before the House which probably involved Clause *a*, Subsection 1 of Section 54 of The Legislative Assembly Act but that motion was withdrawn and the motion which has been passed and referred to this Committee has been substituted, and if you will notice Section 49 of The Legislative Assembly Act it states:

“No Member of the Assembly shall knowingly accept or receive, either directly or indirectly, any fee, compensation or reward for or in respect of the drafting, advising upon, revising, promoting or opposing any Bill, resolution, matter or thing submitted or intended to be submitted to the Assembly or a committee thereof.”

This statement which you this morning admit as having been made is very direct insofar as Section 49 is concerned, when it says:

“If you ask me to state my conviction, I would say that he is being paid to promote that Bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country, exposing himself, I think, to criminal prosecution.”

Now, I think the Committee is of the opinion that that is the outstanding issue so far as Mr. Murphy's position in the House is concerned, and we are not only considering Mr. Murphy, we are also considering every other Member of the House in the charge which has been made by you in the proceedings.

MR. WALDRON: You are also, as I understand, considering me. For example, if I have broken, if I have contravened the law of Parliament then I may be, as it has been said, I may be sent to the tower, I may be imprisoned. So I am as to that making my defence but I am not withdrawing from the obligation which you point out to me to come here and assist this Committee to arrive at the truth, and so when I have completed my statement I stand ready, as I say, to present my witnesses.

MR. TWEED: May I make a suggestion? I would suggest that the witness be allowed to continue with his statement. Now, those of us on the Committee who are not of the legal profession find it difficult to follow with the interruptions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will be very glad.

MR. WALDRON: I have referred to Bourinot. I draw your attention to this fact that in Bourinot, Bourinot recites that there have been two parties on trial in Canadian history, that of Mr. Ure, a reporter, who was reprimanded in 1850 by the Speaker for using loud and offensive language, that is, for insulting a Member, and there was the case of Mr. Macdonell—

THE CHAIRMAN: That is, under section 54?

MR. WALDRON: Exactly, and there was the case in 1879 of Mr. J. A. Macdonell who insulted Mr. Huntingdon. There is no case in the records of Canadian Parliaments—that is, of the Dominion Parliament and of this Parliament, there is no record of anyone being punished for what you would call a slander or for uttering verbally spoken language of abuse of a Member.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not involved here.

MR. WALDRON: No. It is also noteworthy that May records only two proceedings like this in respect of spoken words; one was four hundred years ago and the other was a speech of Daniel O'Connell in 1838. Consequently, I submit that in these days of expanded public liberty, it is not the practice of British Legislatures to challenge the spoken word.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not suggesting that we should repeal The Legislative Assembly Act?

MR. WALDRON: Of course not, it is a bulwark against corruption. Now, my second point is this: The words complained of were absolutely privileged. They were spoken by as counsel in the conduct of an enquiry by a statutory body duly empowered to adjudicate upon and determine the rights of parties.

MR. WILSON: Is it your contention that in a court of justice, one counsel of another can say anything he believes?

A. It is my contention that any counsel may say what he pleases—that is, so far as responsibility to any person whom he may offend. He is always subject to the direction of the judge who may rebuke him, who may oblige him to withdraw, but there is nothing spoken by a judge, counsel or a witness in an English court of law, there is no accountability—

Q. And no responsibility?

A. . None whatever.

MR. SMITH: Whether relevant or not?

A. Whether relevant or not in the course of the action.

MR. WILSON: In other words, he can be totally irresponsible?

A. He can be totally irresponsible and can be totally malicious.

Q. That is the position you take?

A. That is the law. If you want authority for it you may go to the latest discussion that is in the case of *O'Connor v. Waldron*, which went from Mr. Justice Orde, went then to the Court of Appeal and went then to the Supreme Court where it was held and declared again and again that not only in this Province but in all English courts, courts of English countries, judges and counsel and witnesses may speak the thing they will, even with malice. Now, that is the law.

THE CHAIRMAN: Even with malice?

THE WITNESS: Even with malice, even with malice and there is no accountability.

MR. WILSON: And even though it was totally untrue?

A. Even though it was totally untrue. That is the law, and why is it the law? It is in order, as I say later in this statement, to assure a fearless administration of justice, just as your privilege in the House, in respect to which my learned friend took his opportunity against me, you may speak the thing that is in your mind—nobody can sue you, in order that we may have a fearless administration of public affairs. In all courts, in all English countries, judges, lawyers and witnesses are absolutely privileged and may not be brought to account for what they say in court, even if they speak maliciously. This right is conceded only to assure a fearless administration of justice. The Members of this Assembly, speaking from their places in the House, are similarly privileged to assure a fearless consideration of public affairs.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you say, Mr. Waldron, that that goes as far as to impute to a counsel under those circumstances a corruption in his duty as a Member of Parliament?

A. Yes.

Q. Do any of the cases go that far?

A. Waldron and O'Connor went that far, the main question after the first tilt.

Q. Was O'Connor a Member of Parliament?

A. He was a member of the bar. The main question in *O'Connor* and *Waldron* became a question whether I was court, whether I had the function of a court. If it was it was conceded that anything I said was privileged, and Mr. O'Connor claimed that I in criticizing him in the course of the inquiry had in effect charged him with a crime

Q. Mr. O'Connor was not a Member of the Legislative Assembly or of Parliament?

A. No, no, he was a member of the bar seeking, he said, relief against me for having spoken ill of him and as I afterwards did, reported against him as party and privy to the combine which I had under investigation. Now then, the

absolute privilege to which I appeal is part of the law—and I ask the Committee's close attention to this if I may—is part of the law, which cannot be altered by this honourable House by a resolution. I acknowledge the supremacy of the Legislature over the court and judges as well as its power to alter the law. But I affirm that it cannot alter the law of the land or take from anyone a privilege assured by the law but by legislative enactment, that is by a statute. So I say when I spoke in that assembly or in that court the law clothed me with a privilege and I say that the Legislature—not offensively—I submit and affirm that the Legislature cannot take that away from me by any resolution such as you have in mind at the close of these proceedings. Suppose that you were to send me to the tower. You come in conflict at once with the courts of the land, because you are doing this or you will be doing this; you will be depriving me not by legislation but by resolution of my rights under the law. That is my position, but I submit that you may not go one step further—that is, against me; you may go to any length you please in inquiring into the conduct of the fellow Member whose conduct has been challenged by me and I will assist—I submit that you may not go one step further until the House has passed through all stages a Bill enacting in effect that there is no privilege in the courts or no privilege in the courts when Members of this House are spoken of or that Gordon Waldron had no privilege in the Optometry Court when he spoke the words complained of. If it comes to pass that you go on against me and that in the end you consign me to the tower, my friend here will ride post haste to Osgoode Hall to seek my release by Habeas Corpus. Notwithstanding the section of your Legislative Assembly Act which says that no determination of this House in these proceedings shall be questioned, you go outside of your jurisdiction. Now—

THE CHAIRMAN: In effect, Parlaiment under existing law is powerless to deal with you?

A. No, it is not powerless. Oh, yes, under existing law, it is powerless.

Q. That is your contention?

A. Yes, and it is contention which I make with the utmost confidence. Now then, I have a third representation to make to you, I say that Mr. Murphy has by his own admission here and in the House substantiated the charge of which he complains. Knowing Ritholz' interest, he sponsored the Bill—

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you going to read statements? You are prepared to submit evidence as to these facts? If you are going to prove anything against Mr. Murphy it will have to be done in the regular way.

A. Oh, yes, I am making this statement that on his own testimony, on his own admissions in the House and here he has substantiated the charge of which he complains.

MR. SMITH: In other words, you are affirming the truth of your statement?

A. I am. Knowing Ritholz' interest he sponsored the Bill to repeal The Optometry Act of 1931 and deprive the Board of Optometry of the power to try Ritholz' employees. For that, he says, he accepted no fee or reward. That

is what he says. But he accepted from Ritholz' solicitors, he says, a retainer and undertook the defence of Ritholz' employees before the Board. By so doing he divided his interest and lost that independence which The Assembly Act enjoins and the public interest exacts. Clearly, he accepted indirectly if not directly—in the language of your Act—if not directly a fee or reward for the sponsorship of a Bill in contravention of section 49 of The Legislative Assembly Act. That is my contention. He committed a corrupt act for which he may be unseated and rendered himself liable to a fine equal to his fee and \$500.00. To hold otherwise would be in effect to nullify the law and license an unbridled corruption of the Legislature. A Member might with impunity sponsor private legislation and seek his reward in a collateral professional service such as the conduct of a case in the Division Court or the drawing of a deed. One word more and I am done. When I read the remarks of the Prime Minister and the Attorney-General made when Mr. Murphy spoke and moved this matter in the House, I feared that my case had been prejudged. But my profound respect for the institutions of my country and for this, its most exalted tribunal, overcame my fear and I have come at your Speaker's command dutifully and willingly in confident expectation that the House in dealing with this matter will not decline from its best traditions. That is all I have to say at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you file a copy of that statement?

MR. WALDRON: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Before you made the statement which you have admitted making here had you seen a copy of the Bill introduced by Mr. Murphy?

A. No, I saw a copy if you will follow Mr. Baldwin's reading—in the midst of the argument the Bill was laid in my hand.

Q. And it was after you had seen the Bill that you made the statement?

A. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am filing this statement which you have just read, Mr. Waldron, and it will be marked Exhibit "3."

EXHIBIT "3," Mr. Waldron's statement.

MR. MURPHY: May I cross-examine this witness?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I would like you to look at Routine Proceedings, No. 25, under the title "Notices of Motions"—that is, Routine Proceedings, No. 25, of the Legislative Assembly, where Mr. Murphy gives notice that a Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into an alleged insult and libel upon a Member of this Assembly by one Gordon Waldron, Esq., K.C., of Toronto. It is to that motion that that part of your argument with reference to insult and libel.

MR. WALDRON: It was in my mind that I had been charged under clause (a) but I know no other charge that you can make against me.

THE CHAIRMAN: You were not aware of the substitute.

MR. WALDRON: When you remind me of it I do recall Mr. Murphy made motion thereupon the Prime Minister made motion upon which you are acting now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you like to cross-examine, Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURPHY: It is not proposed by this Committee to adjourn this hearing to-day?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Waldron asks for further witnesses. So far as the evidence now before the Committee Mr. Waldron has admitted the statement, pleads justification for it, but I think there is some other evidence the Committee would like to have and I think the Committee will hold another day's sitting. Would you like to ask Mr. Waldron any questions?

By MR. MURPHY:

Q. Did you know that I opposed this Optometry Bill in 1930?

A. No, I did not. Oh, yes, I misunderstood you. I understood that you opposed the Bill which your Bill of this year seeks to repeal.

Q. No, 1930, Mr. Waldron, when the Bill was before the Private Bills Committee?

A. Which Bill?

Q. When the Bill was not reported to the House, the same Act which was enacted in 1931?

A. Yes, I understood that you opposed the amendment and I understood that you opposed it in 1930 and 1931, both.

Q. Well, how did you know that I opposed it in 1930?

A. I was told, I was not present. These days I very seldom go to Parliament.

Q. Well, you have tried twice and failed miserably?

A. I tried three times.

Q. Now, how did you know that the Bill was opposed in 1931?

A. I heard that you opposed in in 1931.

Q. Did you hear why it was opposed in 1930 and 1931?

A. By whom? By you?

Q. Yes?

A. Well, I heard you say, I think, that you regarded it, I think you said, as unjust legislation.

Q. I said pernicious class legislation?

A. Pernicious class legislation—I think it is an excellent Bill.

Q. You agreed with that I suggest until you were retained by the Optometry Board?

A. No, I assisted Mr. Nicol in the framing of the original Bill.

Q. That was in 1920?

A. I was then the advisor of the optometrists.

Q. When was that?

A. I think that was about 1924—1925, I do not recall.

Q. Is that your best recollection of when you assisted Mr. Nicol in preparing the Bill—I understand the Bill was prepared in 1920?

A. No, Mr. Nicol put the Bill through, held sittings in this room.

Q. It was not in 1920?

A. No.

Q. I mean, is there any evidence which you have from my opposition to the Bill in 1930 and 1931 that I was paid to oppose the Bill?

A. I have—

Q. Answer the question, please? Have you any evidence to bring before this Committee?

A. Do you wish to enlarge the enquiry?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I do not think from the position Mr. Waldron is in now that he should be made to disclose what evidence he has in the sense you ask him, Mr. Murphy. We will give him a chance to produce it.

MR. MURPHY: Well, I can cross-examine him, I submit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, you are at full liberty to cross-examine him.

MR. MURPHY: I say, Mr. Waldron, is there any evidence to be produced that was paid to oppose the Bill in 1930 and 1931?

A. I do not care to say.

Q. Well, is there now—I want an answer to that question?

A. I appeal to the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: He can say whether he has evidence without disclosing the evidence. The Committee will judge as to Mr. Waldron's answers and how they regard them.

MR. MURPHY: I ask you?

A. Well, I won't answer now. If I should bring such evidence here and submit it to the House, to the Chairman, it would be for him to say whether it was relevant to this inquiry or admissible. At the present moment I prefer not unless I was really forced; I do not want to discuss what evidence I have.

MR. MURPHY: Well, what does the chair rule about that?

THE CHAIRMAN: If Mr. Waldron wants to take that position and later on has not evidence I suppose the Committee will reach its own conclusions. My own view is I will not force Mr. Waldron at this stage to disclose what his evidence is.

MR. WALDRON: Or to say that he has evidence of that kind or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know that I will go so far as that. It is a matter of inquiry for the Committee to find out whether you have evidence or have not—

MR. WALDRON: I have not said that I have not and I have not said that I have.

MR. SMITH: If Mr. Waldron has not any evidence along the line indicated by Mr. Murphy's cross-examination, then what is the object of Mr. Waldron asking for an adjournment to produce any further evidence, because I think that goes to the very crux of the whole thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, ask your question again.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Waldron's suggestion is to-day that because I was paid a fee to defend these individuals before the Optometry Board, that that is in itself sufficient for him to make a statement I was paid to promote the Bill. Now, that is his statement in effect at the close of this written document he has put before the Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, he has made that quite clear to the Committee.

MR. MURPHY: Because I was paid a fee to defend these individuals, that in itself was indicative that I was paid a fee to promote the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that is reason that he draws conclusion—that is quite fair.

MR. WALDRON: Quite fair.

MR. SMITH: I understand Mr. Waldron quite definitely takes position, without any equivocation, that Mr. Murphy was paid and he has affirmed the truth of the statement.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, which, of course, he cannot do.

MR. SMITH: Then he is entitled to be cross-examined on that, I submit with all deference.

MR. MURPHY: Did you know that Mr. Barnett came in to see me in June of 1932 and complained about the action of the Optometry Board?

A. No, never heard of him.

Q. Is that any indication to you that I was paid to promote the Bill?

A. It would have no significance.

Q. I mean, with your peculiar type of mind it might?

A. Oh, I have excellent—

Q. Excellent for gathering together slanderous statements?

A. That is your assertion and that is your privilege to say.

Q. Now, did you know that a man by the name of Summers came in to see me in December and January who had applied—

A. Did I know—

Q. Do you know anything about it?

A. I have heard of Summer's case.

Q. Do you know that the Summers' case was turned down by the Board and since this matter they have given him his license?

A. No, I did not know that. I do not think that is true.

Q. Was there any indication in that that I was paid to promote the Bill so far as you are concerned? I mean, you can draw some insinuations—

A. I only wish to give testimony of facts; I personally do not know the facts at all. I only heard, hearsay.

Q. Did you know that there was a Mr. Anderson who applied to the Board for a certificate and was refused—do you know anything about an individual who came in to see me?

A. No, I do not know anything of the proceedings of this Board since I went out. When my late friends ceased to govern this country and others came in, the Board apparently thought that they ought to have a friend here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who do you refer to as "your late friends?"

A. By "late friends," Mr. Drury and his Government.

MR. MURPHY: Do you consider Miss MacPhail your late friend?

A. I prefer not to enter into controversy, might become heated. I do not know Miss MacPhail now, I might go that far.

Q. On page 3 you stated: "We have the knowledge of everybody that a Bill is being presented to the Legislature by a Member of the Legislature who is of the counsel of the accused."

A. That is the moment when the Bill was put in my hands.

Q. Of course, this was not in evidence at all, this is your own statement at the conclusion of the hearing. There was no evidence of this Bill?

A. No, there was no evidence, somebody mentioned it.

Q. I will tell you who mentioned it—you asked Brown if I was being paid to promote the Bill, do you remember that?

A. There is some reference to your having sponsored Bill in the Legislature and I did not credit it.

Q. Did not credit what?

A. I did not credit it until they put the Bill in my hand.

Q. Did you read the Mail and Empire of the morning of the 28th of February?

A. No, I have it now in my pocket, which has been given to me since.

Q. Is the reason advanced there as to why the repeal of the Act was placed on the Order Paper?

A. I see they quote your—

Q. Is there a reference about individual who wrote his examination in '23 and applied for certificate and was asked to rewrite his examinations?

A. I was told and I am told your statement was inaccurate; I know nothing of the facts.

Q. Why, the witness is here, Mr. Waldron. You were told that my statement was inaccurate—were you told by the dean of the faculty, Mr. Thompson?

A. I do not remember, several gentlemen told me.

Q. Who told you?

A. Well, I do not know, I do not remember precisely. I think Mr. Thompson told me and other members of the Board.

Q. Did Mr. Thompson tell you that I had spoken some strong words to him so far as the Summers' case was concerned?

A. That would not stick in my memory, because you do speak strong words, light words.

Q. Of course, it takes a lot to get anything to stick in your memory, does it not?

A. Some things penetrate in my memory and stay.

Q. Now, you say: "I draw from that the conclusion that these accused, or the accused Brown, seeks to change the law of the Province in order to relieve him of responsibility for what he has done, that he seeks an adjournment for that purpose, so that your decision may be delayed until he has accomplished a change of the law." Now, did you read this Act as to when it has to come into effect?

A. Yes, comes in the 1st of January, 1934. You might alter that before it is enacted.

Q. Your keen mind and intellect escaped that apparently when you made that statement?

A. I just glanced at the cover and roughly at the contents when placed in my hands.

Q. I say, that statement was wrong then?

A. No, it was not wrong.

Q. Well, it is not right if it is wrong?

A. Well, I think it is right.

Q. Why is it right?

A. If you passed Bill which you proposed to repeal amendments of The Optometry Act in 1931, then this Board was deprived of power, and even if the Act did not come into force until the 1st of January, 1934, as no Board would proceed having been shorn of its power at particular date.

Q. Of course, that is another statement from your keen intellect. Do you remember that the Act in 1931 did not come into force and effect until January, 1932.

A. I do not remember that. I do not dispute that, I do not know it.

Q. So can we get one answer from you that when you made that statement that the accused Brown seeks to change the law of the Province in order to relieve him of responsibility for what he has done—was that correct statement or not?

A. Yes, I think so; I think it was a justified statement.

Q. No question about that?

A. I have none, with all deference to other keen thinkers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it your contention that that was the only source and support of this legislation?

A. No, I know the optometrists, I knew them when they were established first and there were violent elements among them, bellicose, who would fight against anything and I have no doubt that there is opposition of such persons to this Bill.

MR. MURPHY: Did you know I was retained by Mr. Hamilton Cassels to act for these people and a set fee stated?

A. You said in the Legislature that you were retained by Mr. Cassels' firm, a very honourable firm I think you said.

Q. You do not think so?

A. I do think so.

Q. Well now, with your—

A. Keen.

Q. With your keen intellect, we are safe in assuming that your statement that I was paid to promote Bill, which you say now is true—is that true, which you say is true, that I was paid to promote the Bill?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that right?

A. Yes, I say that.

Q. And you make that statement from inference you draw because I was retained and paid to defend four individuals before the Optometry Board, is that correct?

A. In my humble judgment I think that concludes the case as against me.

Q. No, the case against you may be concluded at a later date?

A. I say, the moment you took a fee in a collateral matter from Ritholz that you were guilty of an infraction of Section 49 of the Act, that is my stand.

MR. WILSON: Is it your contention that a barrister, who is a Member of the Legislature, must not plead before a court if he introduced into that Legislature or there has been introduced by any other Member into that Legislature a Bill, the passing of which would affect the jurisdiction of the court before whom he would appear?

A. No, I would not go that far, but what I do say is that if a Member of the Legislature, who is a barrister, accepts a retainer from the people for whom he is promoting a Bill—

THE CHAIRMAN: Retainer as counsel or solicitor?

A. As a counsel or as a solicitor. I think any good lawyer, even with a keen mind, will agree with me.

MR. TAYLOR: Might I ask Mr. Waldron—I do not know whether he cares to answer—is it a fact that Mr. Murphy received a retainer as it were from this firm, Mr. Cassel's firm, to appear before the Board which you claim constitutes a court—is that the only evidence that you are submitting to this Committee or would care to submit?

A. No, I will call witnesses whom I have named, whose knowledge goes beyond mine.

MR. SMITH: I think Mr. Taylor is asking the very question which was in my own mind—as to whether or not the particular payment is the retainer paid to Mr. Murphy or whether he is now going to say that there was a further or other payment or remuneration to Mr. Murphy for sponsoring this Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I understand, up to the present time Mr. Waldron takes the position that his statement as appearing in the Star and taken from the notes of the stenographer sworn here this morning was made because Mr. Murphy had been counsel before the Optometry Board and for that reason only and that having been counsel, and also as a Member of the House introducing a Bill, he connects the two and says, as he has just uttered a moment or two ago, that these circumstances constitute an offence against Section 49 of the Act.

MR. SMITH: And there is no other payment in your mind?

A. I will answer your question if I may. You are Mr. Smith?

Q. Yes?

A. I am not coming here to prosecute Mr. Murphy; I am coming dutifully, as I told the Chairman again and again, to present the evidence I have. If he forces me by pursuing me then I will seek to produce all the evidence I have going even beyond if necessary, if you allow it.

MR. TAYLOR: Just on that point—

THE WITNESS: Do you understand me?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not—going even beyond what?

A. Going even beyond the charge that Mr. Murphy admits being paid to promote this Bill now in the House.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Murphy has not admitted—

MR. MURPHY: That is just the tongue of my learned friend. He should be made to retract that statement. That is the way he has carried on for years.

MR. WILSON: I think that should be struck from the record.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Murphy has not admitted that he has been paid to promote this Bill?

A. No.

Q. You just said that he has?

A. It is just a slip of speech. I do not understand that he has admitted; on the contrary, he has said that he has not been paid to promote that Bill. He says that he was retained by the Cassel's firm to defend Ritholz people before the Optometry Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that these are separate matters—that is his claim?

A. Well, part of the evidence will be to show that they are not.

MR. SMITH: No, but the broad statement, as I understand it, that Mr. Murphy was paid. That is what we are interested in. It does not matter how he was paid—Mr. Murphy's honour is at stake in this matter and I think the whole thing should be cleared up one way or another.

MR. TAYLOR: I think, Mr. Waldron, if that was the only basis on which you wish this Committee to consider whether Mr. Murphy was paid or was—

MR. WALDRON: I have not wished the Committee to do anything. I have come before you because I—because I believe if I did not make a defence I would be sent to the tower.

MR. TAYLOR: Will you answer the question—that in your mind is the only retainer he has received?

A. Again you— Why seek to commit me? The witnesses might all contradict me.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I put this to you: Have you any evidence to substantiate the statement reported in the Star that it was your conviction?

A. I wish you would read from the report, I have copy here. I do not

know the Star. The Star is a very accurate paper but I have not read it. Here it is on page 7.

THE CHAIRMAN: Page 7, I am inquiring, Mr. Waldron, whether when you make the statement: "if you ask me seriously to state my serious conviction I would say that I think he is being paid to promote that Bill?"

A. Well, I think that is not the Star's words, I think not. You say, "I would say that I think he is being paid."

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the Star does not say "think."

MR. SMITH: No, but Mr. Waldron goes further to-day and he says he was paid.

MR. WALDRON: I say it on his own admission.

Q. You are being examined, upon your own statement that Mr. Murphy was paid—now, will you tell us how he was paid?

A. He was paid by accepting a retainer. That is for me sufficient.

Q. What retainer?

A. The retainer from Cassels, Brock.

Q. One retainer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. No other retainer?

A. I—

MR. WILSON: Well, as far as you know?

A. As far as I know at that time, at that moment, that is only retainer.

MR. MURPHY: As far as you know at any time?

A. That is as far as I know personally.

Q. And no person knows anything else?

A. Well, I do not know.

Q. You know they don't. I do not want any statement to go out to the press in a sort of doubtful manner clouding the issue. I am going to ask that this matter be cleared up to-day. I demand that the matter be cleared up to-day.

MR. SMITH: Have you personal knowledge of any other payment?

A. No, I have not personal knowledge.

Q. Have you any witnesses that you intend to bring here to-day that can tell us of any other payment?

A. I wish you would not ask me that.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a fair question.

THE WITNESS: Well, I think I have a witness, yes.

MR. SMITH: You think you have a witness. Now, you are under oath and we want a statement right on the point. Have you a witness or witnesses that you intend to bring here to-day?

A. I have a witness.

Q. Who will swear as to other payments?

A. Yes.

Q. Then I think we should go on to-day and clear this matter up?

A. We cannot go on; I have not all witnesses here.

Q. I asked you if you had witness—

MR. MURPHY: I demand that witnesses be sent for. It is a lie. It is one of the actions of my learned friend against myself to leave this matter in doubt and I want those witnesses sent for.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who is the witness?

A. I refuse to say who is the witness. I will call witnesses if I am obliged to make a case. I am not here to accuse or convict Mr. Murphy; I am here to defend myself.

MR. WILSON: You are further than that; you are here to tell the truth and the whole truth before this Committee?

A. Precisely and that is what I am ready to do and there is my witnesses (indicating piece of paper on table).

MR. SMITH: I think Mr. Murphy's point is well taken, that these insinuations should not be allowed to go out before the country.

MR. MURPHY: I want witness brought here before Mr. Waldron leaves here. He has seen and heard witness and I want him brought here before he leaves the room—

THE CHAIRMAN: Who is your witness?

A. I refuse to say who my witness is. I will produce the witnesses which I have named here.

Q. No, I mean the witness which you just told Mr. Smith can prove other payments than this retainer which Mr. Murphy has received?

A. Well now, then, I refuse to name my witness and expose him. He can come here I suppose and tell his story.

Q. Can you send anyone for him?

A. No, you cannot send anyone for him.

MR. SMITH: Summons can be issued and he can be obtained if in the city in a few moments.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is his name, because the Committee wants to summons him?

A. I wont give his name; I have given you his name there.

Q. Is it Ivan S. Nott?

A. I refuse to say.

Q. Is it Guiseppi Saperito?

A. I refuse to say.

Q. Is it William Matthews?

A. I refuse to say.

Q. Is it J. C. M. German?

A. I refuse to say.

Q. Is it W. C. Summers?

A. I refuse to say.

Q. Is it Edward Bind?

A. I refuse to say.

Q. Is it Mr. Humphries?

A. I refuse to say.

Q. So that you will not give to this Committee the name of the witness you have just told Mr. Smith can give evidence as to payments made to Mr. Murphy to promote this Bill?

A. No, I will not to-day. I will put the witness in the box.

Q. I will give you notice now that the Committee would like the name of that witness now?

A. Well, I cannot give to you the name of—

Q. And whatever powers this Committee have will be used in a manner that may affect you personally because you withhold the name of this witness?

A. I am unaffected by your threat.

Q. It is not a threat?

A. It is, with great respect.

Q. Power to deal with a person who makes charge such as you do and refuses to summons witness to appear before us?

A. You have request for summons laying before you.

Q. I want the name of the man; I will give you final opportunity to tell us?

A. The statement was forced out of me.

Q. Of course, it was forced out of you—this Committee has very broad and wide powers?

A. You have not powers to do irregular things.

Q. You are not going to bulldoze this Committee. You are going to have the opportunity now, if you care to, to give us the name of this man?

A. Well, I decline respectfully, with profound respect. I will produce my witness. You remember that this Committee was called last Friday and I was not notified and discussion took place which I have read this morning that I should have an opportunity to call witnesses. Now you want me to give names of my witnesses here and what they say. I refuse, and respectfully I refuse.

MR. MURPHY: May I have the list of the witnesses?

MR. WALDRON: That is improper; he should not see a list of the witnesses.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Murphy furnished a list of his—

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Waldron's witnesses are here—Mr. Summers, Mr.—

THE CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Ivan Nott in the room? Is he here? Is Mr. Guiseppi Saperito here?

A VOICE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Come up here and sit down in this chair. (Mr. Saperito comes forward.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. James C. Thompson of 138 St. George Street—is he here? William Matthews?

A VOICE: Here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Come up this way, Mr. Matthews. (Mr. Matthews comes forward.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. J. C. M. German, is he here?

MR. MURPHY: Can easily get him here; he is a lawyer. Mr. Humphries is from the Attorney-General's Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. W. J. Summers?

A VOICE: Here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Come up, Mr. Summers. (Mr. Summers comes forward.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Might send for Mr. German and Ivan Nott.

MR. MURPHY: They can be got easily.

THE CHAIRMAN: Edward Bind, 2513 Yonge Street.

MR. MURPHY: He can be got quite easily too.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want Mr. Edward Bind of 2513 Yonge Street brought here at once.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is William Matthews here?

A VOICE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Thompson here?

A VOICE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Waldron, three of your witnesses—Mr. Summers, Mr. Matthews and Mr. Saperito—are here. Do you wish to call them?

MR. WALDRON: Not to-day; I will call all my witnesses when I have subpoenaed and brought their papers, etc., according to the arrangement which you outlined last Friday. I will not be forced and driven. I will otherwise retire from this investigation and you may do as you please.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, that is just what I please.

MR. SMITH: We have no control over Mr. Waldron.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, we have. Mr. Waldron is not going to run this Committee of the Legislature in a way that suits Mr. Waldron.

MR. WALDRON: And this Legislative Committee is not going to run Mr. Waldron.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are here to discharge a very important duty to this House.

MR. WALDRON: And I offered to assist you.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been made very clear this morning that in the statement which Mr. Waldron has made to the effect that Mr. Murphy has been paid to promote this Bill that when he made that statement what he had in mind was the fact that Mr. Murphy had been retained by Cassels and Brock in his capacity as a counsel and that from that he draws the inference which allows him in making the statement which he says he is justified in making, that Mr. Murphy was paid to introduce the Bill. Mr. Smith has asked him whether he has any evidence other than that to submit as to Mr. Murphy being paid to promote the Bill. He says he has, that he has a witness, and I assume that he means by that that he has a witness who will testify here before this Committee to the effect that Mr. Murphy in some other manner has been paid to promote this Bill. The Committee has asked Mr. Waldron to give the name of the witness, which he declines to do. It is important that the Committee should have that witness before them promptly. There is a list of witnesses submitted by Mr. Waldron that he wishes called—Ivan S. Nott, Mr. Saperito, James C. Thompson, William Matthews, J. C. M. German, Mr. Summers and Edward Bind, Mr. Humphries. Of these witnesses, three of them are now in court. I have asked Mr. Waldron if he wishes to examine them. Mr. Waldron, although the witnesses are present, declines to examine them, says he is not ready to examine them. The other witnesses I have directed Mr. Lewis, the Clerk of the House, to have brought here forthwith.

MR. WALDRON: Mr. Chairman, you—

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Waldron, you still decline to name to this Committee the witness you point out you have, in answer to Mr. Smith, who can testify as to some payment to Mr. Murphy being paid to promote the Bill?

MR. WALDRON: I refuse to go beyond what I have done. I refer you to your own statement last Friday at page 10:

“Mr. Murphy has suggested the names of certain persons which complies with your view, Mr. Tweed, as far as Mr. Murphy is concerned. Mr. Waldron will be subpoenaed, and if there are other parties he desires to have present, we will arrange to have them subpoenaed.”

Now then, nobody on that would contemplate this trial being forced—

THE CHAIRMAN: You were asked when you were served if you had any witnesses you wished called.

MR. WALDRON: And I came to-day and told you who they were.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you have three of them here now. The Committee would like to hear them.

MR. WALDRON: Well, the Committee may examine them.

MR. HILL: Did Mr. Waldron say that this witness that would testify was one of those names there?

MR. WALDRON: No, he has not said that.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, he has.

MR. HILL: Yes, he has.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the list.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, one of the list. The other three are available. They are all available by telephone.

MR. SMITH: That is compliance with what was said last Friday morning.

MR. WALDRON: What is?

THE CHAIRMAN: That we are having your witnesses come here to testify.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Waldron suggested to-day that he had witnesses and here are three of them sitting in the court room.

MR. WALDRON: I did not know that. I assure you that I did not know that one of those witnesses was in the room when we came in.

MR. SMITH: You know they are here now.

MR. WALDRON: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want opportunity now to examine them?

MR. WALDRON: I will not; it is asked I examine them to-day—I will not examine them to-day.

MR. MURPHY: I submit the Committee have right to examine witnesses.

MR. WALDRON: I want these witnesses to be subpoenaed, to be called to bring their books and papers, and I am not going to examine them until they are fully equipped to come—

MR. MURPHY: Books and papers—one of the men was out of work for seven months.

MR. WALDRON: We are at that impasse at the moment.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have not any objection to the Committee finding anything out of them?

MR. WALDRON: Oh, I will retain still the right to examine them if I am further pursued.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have the wrong idea of this.

MR. WALDRON: No, I have not

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not pursuing you; we are asking you to come before this Committee—

MR. WALDRON: Well, am I absolved—

MR. MURPHY: I ask as a matter of right to have these witnesses examined and others brought here; I do not want any adjournment of this matter so that my learned friend might get some person to come and testify falsely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of this Committee that these witnesses be heard now? (After conference by members of Committee it was decided to hear witnesses.)

W. J. SUMMERS, sworn. Examined:

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Murphy

MR. MURPHY: As a matter of fact, Mr. Summers, you are one of the individuals who came in to see me, who lived in my riding at the time?

A. Yes.

Q. You came in and complained about the actions of the Optometry Board?

A. Yes.

Q. You made an application for a certificate, is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You passed your examinations in 1923?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And when you applied to the Board in November they told you you had to write further examinations?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are that gentleman?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you came into me and you remember me taking the matter up with Mr. Humphries of the Attorney-General's Department, is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you appeared before the Board sometime in February, is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you appeared before the Board you were refused a certificate?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then after this long perambulation before the Board of these different cases they called you up and gave you a certificate?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were out of work at the time?

A. I was.

Q. You were working for the Hart Optical Company or was it a company?

A. No, I was not working with anybody.

Q. You were looking for a position?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were a married man with two children out of work at the time?

A. One child.

Q. And you came to me to assist you to get your certificate back?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any suggestion at any time of my charging you any fee?

A. No, there was not.

Q. Did you hear at any time of my asking for any money in connection with the work I did?

A. No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions, Mr. Waldron.

MR. WALDRON: I refuse unless—

MR. MURPHY: Did you know of any suggestion at any time about me being paid to promote the Optometry Bill?

A. I do not.

MR. SMITH: And you do not know of any such payment?

A. No, I do not.

MR. WILSON: Is there any light you can throw on this matter that you have not spoken of?

A. No, there is not.

MR. MURPHY: You have at least to be grateful to me, Mr. Summers, for getting your certificate, do you not think, as a result of antagonistic attitude that we took that the certificate was granted?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You did not get anything through this individual, Mr. Waldron, did you?

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other member of the Committee would like to ask any questions?

Q. That is all you can tell us in this matter?

A. That is all I can say.

MR. WILSON: There are not any records that you have that will help the Committee?

A. No, there are none.

WILLIAM MATTHEWS, sworn. Examined by MR. MURPHY:

Q. You are an optometrist?

A. Yes sir.

Q. Did you ever have any conversation with me or any person else about me being paid to promote the repeal of The Optometry Act?

A. About you being—?

Q. Yes?

A. No, sir.

Q. You have not any books or anything to produce?

A. To show that you were paid?

Q. Yes?

A. No, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any member of the Committee would like to ask questions? This statement was made by Mr. Waldron at a hearing before—

“MR. WALDRON: Board of Examiners in Optometry.

THE CHAIRMAN: In which he said: “if you ask me seriously to state my serious conviction I would say that I think he is being paid to promote that Bill . . .”

A. I certainly do not.

Q. Have you any evidence or suggestion that you could give to help the Committee in any way in this inquiry?

A. That Mr. Murphy was paid?

Q. Yes?

A. No, sir.

GUISEPPI SAPERITO, sworn. Examined by MR. MURPHY:

Q. Are you an optometrist?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I never saw you before, did I?

A. I believe so, I saw you on the street a few times.

Q. Have you got any books or any evidence to produce that I was paid to promote the repeal of The Optometry Act?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you tell anybody that I was?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever tell Mr. Waldron or any of his associates?

A. No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions, gentlemen?

MR. MURPHY: You have no records or books to prove any of these statements made by Mr. Waldron?

A. No.

MR. WALDRON: As we go on I will call all these witnesses back.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may, Mr. Waldron—you have had your opportunity.

MR. WALDRON: Very good, you have had yours.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any evidence that you can give that will help this Committee in this inquiry, throw any light on the statement of Mr. Waldron, who says: "If you ask me seriously to state my serious conviction I would say that I think he is being paid to promote that Bill?"

A. No, I have not anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is J. C. M. German here? (No answer.) Mr. James C. Thompson?

A VOICE: Not present.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ivan Nott?

A VOICE: Not present.

THE CHAIRMAN: You might find out if Mr. Lewis has anything to report of these witnesses?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Humphries should be here. (At this stage a recess was taken while witnesses were being sent for.)

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think Mr. Waldron should leave the room.

MR. WALDRON: Does my learned friend suggest that I am not free to come and go as I please?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not until the Committee is adjourned. If you want to go outside for a moment or two I have not the slightest objection. You will come back, of course.

After recess.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, have any of the witnesses arrived yet? Is Mr. James C. Thompson here?

A VOICE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Waldron is at the door, ask him to come in.

(Mr. Waldron returns to the room.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, if the Committee will come to order again, Mr. James C. Thompson has arrived.

JAMES C. THOMPSON, sworn. Examined by MR. MURPHY:

Q. You are the Dean of the College of Optometry?

A. I am.

Q. And do you know of any money being paid me to promote the repeal of The Optometry Act?

A. I do not.

Q. Have you got any books, papers or documents to prove that I did?

A. I have not.

Q. As a matter of fact I spoke to you in regard to Summers, you remember?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the Board refused him a certificate in February or January—January 19th and 20th the Board sat?

A. They did, that is right.

Q. And you as a matter of fact did not approve of the Board's action in that particular instance?

MR. WILSON: Do you think he ought to be asked that, in view of his position?

MR. MURPHY: I want to show that attitude towards the repeal of this Act has been consistent?

A. I am Secretary of the Board of Examiners in Optometry.

Q. In any event there is never any suggestion to you or by yourself that I was paid to promote the repeal of The Optometry Act?

A. No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any knowledge, Mr. Thompson, that Mr. Murphy, Member for St. Patrick, has been paid to promote this Bill with reference to optometry introduced by him this Session?

A. I have no knowledge of money being paid to Mr. Murphy.

Q. Have you any information of any kind you can give that would be of

information to the Committee touching on the promotion of this Bill so far as payment is concerned?

A. No. Well, as regards Mr. Murphy, I heard—

Q. Not what you heard, that you know. Have you anything of your own knowledge that you can tell us?

A. Unless I go back to three years ago when the Bill was in the House for the first time I heard a man state—

Q. Now, you cannot tell us—if you tell us the man we will have the man here but we cannot let a lot of hearsay evidence float around about a man. Have you any knowledge yourself of Mr. Murphy in his capacity as a Member of the Legislature receiving any pay to promote a Bill before the Legislature?

A. No, I have not.

Q. And you have no evidence whatever then?

A. No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

IVAN S. NOTT, called—does not answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. German here or Mr. Ivan A. Nott? Mr. Nott I am informed will be here in about ten minutes.

MR. MURPHY: Who is there left? Mr. Humphries—

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Humphries, Mr. German and Mr. Nott. Mr. Lewis reports that Mr. Nott will be here at 12.30. That Mr. German has been sent for and will be up shortly. There will be a recess for a few moments.

After recess.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ivan S. Nott, come up this way. Mr. Edward Binns, he does not answer.

IVAN S. NOTT, sworn. Examined by MR. MURPHY:

Q. You are a practising registered optometrist?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And do you know of any payment made to me to promote the repeal of The Optometry Act?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you any books or papers in connection with any payment made?

A. No, I have not.

Q. Of moneys to promote the repeal of The Optometry Act?

A. No, I have not.

MR. SMITH: Or any other payment to Mr. Murphy in connection with the Act—whether to promote it or otherwise?

A. No, sir, I have not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions? That is all, Mr. Nott, thank you. Is Mr. Binns or Binds here yet? Mr. J. C. M. German? Well, gentlemen, while these witnesses are coming, perhaps you would like to hear Mr. Cassels who has been summonsed here to-day as a witness.

HAMILTON CASSELS, sworn. Examined by MR. MURPHY:

Q. Mr. Cassels, on the 25th of February you retained me to appear before the Board of Optometry in connection with the defence of four men?

A. I did.

Q. Who were charged with fraud, misrepresentation and incompetency—I think were the charges?

A. That is correct.

MR. WALDRON: I suggest that Mr. Murphy ask the questions properly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I agree.

MR. MURPHY: What retainer was agreed upon between you and myself?

A. You were to be paid \$200 for acting as counsel.

Q. And the case lasted how many days?

A. The case began on March 7th and lasted into the 8th and 9th; was spoken to on March 6th on the question of adjournment but the adjournment was refused and the case did not commence until noon of the 7th.

Q. It really occupied four days of time?

A. Practically.

Q. And was there any suggestion by you to me that there was any money should be paid in connection with the promotion of the repeal of The Optometry Act?

A. None whatsoever.

Q. Never at any time?

A. Never at any time whatsoever, and anyone who suggests that I offered to pay Mr. Murphy or that anyone else I was associated with and with my knowledge offered to pay Mr. Murphy any money for promoting the Act is lying, and I want that understood.

MR. WILSON: Had you any thought in engaging Mr. Murphy that was influencing in any way his attitude towards this legislation?

A. Not the slightest. As far as I know the people I was representing, the company of which they were employees, had nothing whatsoever to do with promoting this legislation. As a matter of fact, I heard long before that Mr. Murphy was moving to amend The Optometry Act because of matters which had nothing whatsoever to do with the company which was represented at this proceeding. I retained Mr. Murphy because there were five people charged with this offence, which were *quasi* criminal in their nature, and because he is one of the best known criminal counsel in town and also because I knew that he was familiar with the Act and had acted for other optometrists, who in most cases were not in any way connected with the company of which these people charged were employees.

MR. TAYLOR: This \$200 was the full amount that Mr. Murphy was to receive either by way of fees or otherwise?

A. That is correct.

MR. HILL: Is that ordinary fee for work of that kind?

A. Well, it certainly is not a big fee. When I was consulted by my clients I told them that I thought because of the number of people charged and the serious nature of the charges that counsel should be retained, and they asked me how much it would cost, and as a matter of fact said that they could not afford to pay very much, and I put it up to Mr. Murphy and asked him if he was prepared to act for a fee of \$200 and he said yes.

MR. MURPHY: You said, Mr. Cassels—now that I think back over it—that this matter would take about a day and a half at the time—that was your recollection of it?

A. Yes, I do not remember that exactly. I remember getting in touch with you and remember mentioning that fee, which was mentioned by my client.

MR. WALDRON: May I ask this question? Who are these persons you represent?

A. These people I represent are all employees of the Ritholz Optical Company.

Q. Ritholz Optical have headquarters in Chicago?

A. That is correct. There is Ontario Company.

Q. I know, a subsidiary?

A. Well, I suppose you would call it subsidiary, yes.

Q. And from whom did you hear that Mr. Murphy was promoting the Bill?

A. I heard from Mr. Murphy himself.

Q. Mr. Murphy told you in February?

A. He told me—I cannot remember the date but I would say weeks before this matter ever came up.

Q. You were served yourself or your clients were served on the 20th of February to appear on the 6th March?

A. That is correct.

Q. And the Bill received its first reading on the 6th March?

A. That I cannot say.

Q. Well, the Bill is here?

A. Well, I cannot speak as to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first reading was the 25th of February.

MAJOR LEWIS: March 6th the first reading.

THE WITNESS: Yes, the 6th of March.

MR. WALDRON: Did you help draw the Bill?

A. I did not.

Q. Did you see it before it was presented to the House?

A. I did not.

Q. When did you commence to be solicitor of Ritholz of Chicago?

A. We acted for this company first in 1931.

Q. When the Optometrists obtained the amendments which are now set forth in the Act of 1931?

A. That is correct.

Q. And you opposed it?

A. That is correct.

Q. Ritholz opposed it?

A. That is correct.

Q. Ritholz himself, one of the Ritholz'—Benjamin, David or Moses, Aaron or Rebecca, came over here and lobbied in this House?

A. In 1931—

Q. I ask you that question?

A. I don't think so but I cannot speak definitely as to that.

Q. Whether it was that year or the year before?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you acting in the year before, in 1930?

A. I did not.

Q. Did you converse with Ritholz' here—did you converse with them?

A. In 1931?

Q. Yes?

A. I remember meeting Mr. Ritholz once in 1931, I think it was, when the matter was before the Committee that dealt with it, on one occasion only.

Q. And did you hear him on that occasion clap his pocket and say that he could buy this Legislature as he bought legislature in the United States?

A. I did not.

Q. You did not hear that?

A. No, and if he made that remark I would have answered properly and told him what I thought of it, and I do not believe that he made the remark.

Q. You are sensitive about these matters?

A. I am sensitive about— May I answer your question? I am sensitive about absolutely unwarranted, unjustified, scurrilous statements that are made by you without any justification at all, as any decent man would be.

Q. I thank you very much about that. You are sensitive about matters of decorum in the practice of law?

A. I hope so.

Q. You knew Legislative Assembly Act?

A. I knew there was such an Act, yes, sir.

Q. And having been associated with Mr. Murphy to the resistance made to the amendments in 1931 you came down to 1933—

MR. MURPHY: There was no resistance by me in 1931—there was a Select Committee.

MR. WALDRON: Please.

MR. MURPHY: Well, do not make statements here that you do not know what you are talking about.

MR. WALDRON: Mr. Murphy was actively engaged in 1931 in resisting the amendments then proposed?

A. I was not associated with Mr. Murphy.

Q. I did not ask you that?

A. You made that statement at the outset. You said, "you were associated with Mr. Murphy in opposing the amendments of 1931." I was not associated with Mr. Murphy in opposing amendments of 1931.

Q. Did you speak with him at all?

A. I probably spoke with him.

Q. And was not he the head and front of the resistance in the House amongst the Members?

A. I would not say so.

Q. Who else were?

A. There were many Members opposed to it.

Q. Well, won't you tell us what Mr. Murphy was doing in 1931 in this House?

A. Mr. Murphy I understood was opposed to it as many other Members were.

Q. Yes, but was he resisting the Bill?

A. He was opposing the Bill.

Q. And knowing that you found him in 1933, on your suggestion, promoting a Bill to repeal?

A. Yes.

Q. Without any suggestion from you?

A. Without any suggestion from me at all.

Q. Without your concurrence?

A. Well, if you mean by "concurrence," I guess I approved of the amendment.

Q. You approved of his making an amendment to repeal the Bill in 1931?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And then you hired him; you who were sensitive in these matters of public duty, you hired him—

MR. SMITH: Surely, that is not a word—

MR. WALDRON: You retained him and agreed to pay him \$200 for it—that is the fact, is it not—a day and a half's service?

THE CHAIRMAN: The evidence is about four days, although they thought it would take a day and a half.

MR. WALDRON: He said you retained him for \$200 to defend Ritholz' employees?

A. I did.

Q. And you were sensitive about these matters?

A. Certainly—I see nothing wrong for one minute in that.

Q. You knew The Legislative Assembly Act?

A. Certainly.

Q. Did you think you were offering him bribe?

A. I did not and I very much resent your suggestion it was a bribe.

Q. I know—it is too bad?

A. It is too bad you have got a habit of making statements.

Q. No, I have not the habit?

A. Well, your record shows that.

Q. Well, my record does not show anything of the kind. Now then, how much have you paid Mr. Murphy?

A. I have not paid him anything at all yet.

Q. How much did you, if anything, pay him in 1931?

A. I paid him nothing whatsoever and I do not believe he got paid anything.

Q. Let us get the facts; never mind. Did you know of Benjamin, David or Aaron Moses paying him anything in 1931?

A. I did not.

MR. MURPHY: That is an uncalled for question because I do not even know the individuals whom this man is talking about.

MR. WALDRON: Did you know the Ritholz Optical Company of Chicago or Toronto paying to Mr. Murphy in 1931 any money?

A. I did not.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no suggestion that has been the case either.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Waldron is assuming responsibility now by his examination.

MR. MURPHY: He is just making the charge worse than it is.

MR. WALDRON: Now, tell me what I was at?

MR. MURPHY: Sit down.

MR. WALDRON: You say I must give testimony to help you. Now, I am inquiring of this gentleman and you say I am broadening the inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question which Mr. Smith is objecting to is suggestion, without anything here to substantiate it, suggestion that possibly Mr. Murphy was paid by some of the Ritholz people or firm back in 1931. No suggestion has been made concerning that even by yourself other than this cross-examination nor has there been any suggestion from any other quarter.

MR. WALDRON: Well, do you want to inquire or do you want to stop me?

THE CHAIRMAN: If you want to include that as part of your charge here, we will certainly allow you to do so.

MR. WALDRON: I think the question is perfectly proper.

MR. SMITH: I submit that Mr. Waldron be permitted to proceed with this examination.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. WALDRON: Now, where were we at?

The reporter turns back and reads the question:

"MR. WALDRON: Did you know the Ritholz Optical Company of Chicago or Toronto paying to Mr. Murphy in 1931 any money?"

A. I did not."

Q. You say you do not know that they paid him anything in 1933?

A. I certainly do not.

Q. Did you see Ritholz in the month of February?

A. Of what year?

Q. Of this year?

A. I did not.

Q. Did you know that he was here?

A. I did not.

Q. Or any of his firm?

A. You mean of his firm from out of town?

Q. Yes?

A. I did not.

Q. What do your books say about your account with Mr. Murphy?

A. We have no entry of Mr. Murphy's name at all.

Q. Will you produce your books?

A. Certainly, you are welcome to go through them from start to finish.

Q. Well, the Committee is?

A. We have no account at all for Mr. Murphy.

Q. The Ritholz business is managed here by Harold C. Brown?

A. That is right.

Q. Who was charged the other day before the Optometry Board and tried?

A. Yes.

Q. And found guilty of misrepresentation?

A. Yes—and that is now in appeal—in fairness to Mr. Brown that should be stated.

Q. That is the fact?

A. The fact is that he was found guilty of certain charges before the Board of Examiners in Optometry, and his case is now in appeal.

Q. He was found guilty of fraudulent advertising, in short?

A. Yes, by the Board of Examiners in Optometry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not before the courts?

A. No, not before the courts.

MR. WALDRON: And have you account with Mr. Hal Brown or the Ritholz Company, Limited, of Toronto?

A. We have.

Q. Will you produce that?

A. Certainly.

MR. WALDRON: That is all.

MR. HILL: Did you suggest that the Committee of 1931 was unduly influenced in any way by—

MR. WALDRON: I did not.

MR. HILL: If you did not, it is all right; I happened to be on that Committee.

MR. WALDRON: I inquired. In a legal inquiry where you are seeking the truth you dig right to the bottom.

MR. CASSELS: May I just say this: Mr. Waldron asked me if I had assisted in framing the Act in any way, which is perfectly true. As a matter of fact, Mr. Murphy, who knew that I had been opposing the Act before, asked me what my views on the subject were and I told him. I had argued the thing before the Committee several times in 1931 when we were first consulted, and another thing I wanted to make clear is this: I think it was February 24 that I first consulted Mr. Murphy. As a matter of fact at that time I said that it was on the 25th, but it was as a matter of fact on the 24th that I wrote to Mr. Murphy and it was on that date that I was first consulted—

MR. WALDRON: Consulted by—?

A. Consulted by Mr. Brown.

Q. On that date Mr. Brown consulted you about the man Summers?

A. No, he never consulted us about the man Summers at all.

Q. He did not?

A. No.

Q. Now, you are speaking of the 24th February?

A. Yes.

Q. On the 25th February do you know that Mr. Murphy wrote a letter to Mr. Humphries for Summers?

A. I do not.

MR. MURPHY: Which is a lie; it was 25th January.

MR. WALDRON: Well, we will prove—

MR. MURPHY: Oh, you cannot prove anything except you are alive.

MR. WALDRON: Now, Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think you should go that far, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Well, it is aggravating to make these statements.

MR. WALDRON: It is not aggravating—I will produce Mr. Humphries.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your contention on that point?

MR. WALDRON: Mr. Murphy wrote a letter, I am told, on the 25th February, perhaps 24th, to Mr. Humphries

Q. Do you know that Summers was sent to Mr. Murphy by Hal Brown?

A. I do, but I know nothing whatsoever about his writing a letter on the 24th.

Q. You know—?

A. May I please be given an opportunity to answer. If you think you can bully me here as you attempted to bully me before the Board of Examiners in Optometry you are mistaken. I will answer any question you care to ask but I want an opportunity of answering it and not being bullied by you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ask the questions, Mr. Waldron.

MR. WALDRON: What was the last question?

The Reporter turns back and reads:

"MR. WALDRON: Mr. Murphy wrote a letter I am told on the 25th February, perhaps 24th, to Mr. Humphries. "Do you know that Summers was sent to Mr. Murphy by Hal Brown?"

"A. I do not but I know nothing whatsoever about his writing a letter on the 24th."

THE WITNESS: I do know that that letter was written on the 24th February and I do not know when it was written; I just want to make that clear.

Q. You say you do know that Summers was sent to Mr. Murphy?

A. I did not.

Q. Who sent him?

A. I understand from Mr. Brown that he had sent him.

Q. That Mr. Hal Brown had sent him?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Hal Brown, Manager of Ritholz' in Toronto at that time—whether on the 23rd January or 25th February—sent Summers to Mr. Murphy?

A. Well, at some time.

Q. Did you understand that the Toronto Ritholz Company was employing Mr. Murphy to intercede in the departments for Mr. Summers?

A. I did not.

Q. Mr. Summers was employed by the Ritholz Company?

A. I did not know.

Q. I ask you if you know that Mr. Summers was employed by the Ritholz Company in Toronto?

A. I know that now, yes.

Q. And that he was sent to Mr. Murphy in January or February and the Bill was presented to you for advice on what date?

A. That I do not remember.

THE CHAIRMAN: What Bill?

MR. WALDRON: The Bill now before the House.

THE WITNESS: It was not presented to me at all; you are not right in putting

that statement in my mouth; I did not say it was presented to me at all. What I did say—that Mr. Murphy asked me what my views were.

Q. Mr. Murphy asked you what your views were and then you hired him for the sixth?

A. I beg your pardon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sixth of what?

MR. WALDRON: You retained him?

A. I wrote to Mr. Murphy on February 24th, as I said before, I tried to get in touch with him on that date and could not and so I sent a copy—that was the day I was first consulted by my clients. I wrote to Mr. Murphy that day, not being able to get in touch with him, and told him that I wanted to speak to him about this matter.

Q. What matter?

A. The charges against these five optometrists. I was not able to get him that day, I called him up the next morning and saw him the following day.

Q. You wrote a letter?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you produce it?

A. Yes, certainly.

Q. Will you produce any other letters that you have?

A. I will, I will produce them right now.

MR. MURPHY: There is the original.

THE CHAIRMAN: Letter produced and marked Exhibit "4."

EXHIBIT "4": Letter dated February 24th, 1933.

"E. J. Murphy, Esq.,
372 Bay Street, Toronto.

"Toronto, February 24th, 1933.

"Dear Eddie:

"I enclose a copy of a letter which Mr. H. C. Brown of the Ritholz Optical Co. and some of the other employees of that company who are registered optometrists have received from the Secretary of the Board. I would like to talk this matter over with you and will give you a call some time later on to-day or to-morrow.

"Yours faithfully,

"Hamilton Cassels."

Q. Any other correspondence?

A. Just correspondence with the Board.

MR. SMITH: Is that material here?

Mr. Hamilton Cassels looks through correspondence.

THE WITNESS: There is correspondence with the Board if you want it.

Q. Have you any correspondence with the Ritholz people?

A. None at all.

Q. With Hal Brown?

A. None.

Q. With the Chicago office or any member of the company there?

A. None.

Q. None whatever?

A. None whatever.

Q. Have you any letters received from Hal Brown or the Toronto Ritholz Company, Limited, or the Chicago Company or any of its members?

A. None.

Q. With whom did you confer when you dealt with the Ritholz Company?

A. I conferred with Mr. Brown. Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to say this: Mr. Waldron has made certain statements which to some extent involve me, without actually making a charge against me, and I want to have this opportunity of making it perfectly plain that I did nothing in this transaction that I did not consider perfectly right and honest and which I consider perfectly right and honest now. I do not think that there was anything in this transaction that was not perfectly ethical, not one thing. Now, there have been insinuations made without any justification for those insinuations whatsoever, and I just want to say here and now that I resented to the utmost of my ability when Mr. Waldron made those statements before the Board, I tried to make it clear; I was overruled on every occasion. None of my objections were sustained and it was just overruled in every possible case, and I want to take this opportunity of again saying there is absolutely nothing so far as I am concerned, and I am satisfied as far as Mr. Murphy and Mr. Brown and any of the others are concerned that is not absolutely ethical and right.

THE CHAIRMAN: How long have you known Mr. Murphy as a lawyer, Mr. Cassels?

A. I have known Mr. Murphy for twelve years.

Q. And during that period what is his reputation in the criminal courts?

A. He is one of the outstanding criminal counsel in Toronto.

Q. When these men were charged as you have told us, had you previously had any dealing with Mr. Murphy?

A. Yes, I have sent two or three criminal matters to him.

Q. I mean, in connection with this?

A. Had I retained him in connection with this?

Q. Yes?

A. No, but I knew that he had acted for different optometrists.

Q. What was in your mind when you selected Mr. Murphy to act for these people?

A. Oh, the prime thing in my mind was the fact that he was a leading criminal counsel, and these charges were *quasi* criminal in their nature. There was charges of fraud and misrepresentation. I knew also that he had acted in the past for other optometrists and was conversant with the Act.

Q. What do you say as to the amount of the fee?

A. Well, I considered it was a most reasonable fee.

MR. MURPHY Inadequate—four days.

THE WITNESS: Excuse me, Mr. Waldron has asked for certain evidence—our books. I am perfectly willing that the Committee should see our books.

MR. WALDRON: Well, bring them down.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is asked us whether there was any account there of Mr. Murphy?

A. There is not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to have these books produced?

MR. WALDRON: I do not want—you want.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will decide if we do, Mr. Cassels.

MR. SMITH: We are not interested in the books unless some reference to Mr. Murphy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Binns here?

EDWARD BINNS, sworn. Examined by THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you know Mr. Murphy?

A. I know him now. I met him at the proceedings of the Board against Ritholz.

MR. MURPHY: Have you any knowledge that you know of that I was paid to promote the repeal of The Optometry Act?

A. I did not know.

Q. Have you got any books or papers or anything in connection with it?

A. No, I have not.

Q. The first time I saw you was when you were giving expert evidence before the Optometry Board, is not that right?

A. Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your occupation?

A. I am an optometrist.

Q. And have you any information as to this Optometry Act in so far as Mr. Murphy being paid to advance its cause in the House?

A. I have no actual proof.

Q. Have you any knowledge of your own?

A. Well, I would take it as a natural assumption.

Q. What as a natural assumption?

A. I would take it as a natural assumption when a man is appearing on behalf of a firm before a court and at the same time presenting a Bill which is practically identical, in which the principles are identical, that there is a connection at least.

Q. Other than that have you any knowledge?

A. I have no direct knowledge.

Q. It is to be inferred because he appeared in those cases?

A. I would take it as a natural assumption.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Waldron takes the position that Mr. Murphy was actually

paid for his services in connection with this Bill, whether promoting it or otherwise. Now, I would like you to answer under oath whether you know of your own knowledge, personal knowledge, of any such payment?

A. I do not know, but the two are so closely linked together, and if being paid for the one service I would assume being paid for both.

Q. Why would you assume that?

A. Because the two things are so very closely linked. In the one case he is defending a firm or men against charges of misrepresentation and fraud by the Board, which I believe were justified, and at the same time he is presenting a Bill to the House which would stop the Board from carrying this action further.

Q. Now, I am putting it to you fairly: Are you aware or were you aware before you gave evidence this morning that the Bill which Mr. Murphy introduced into the House would not come into effect until the 1st day of January next, 1934?

A. No, I was not aware of that.

Q. Now, knowing that now, would you change your opinion with respect to the situation?

A. No, I would not because the things are so closely linked together, that to any thinking man, particularly where he has profession at heart, where he is a member of profession trying to build profession up, I would say that any reasonable men would come to the same conclusion.

Q. In other words, speaking of a reasonable man and what you would do, you are putting yourself in the position of Mr. Murphy and what you would do if you were in Mr. Murphy's position, is that right?

A. I think so.

MR. WILSON: Might I just ask: You know there is a Moratorium Bill before the Legislature?

A. I do not.

Q. On mortgages?

A. No, I am not interested at all in that.

Q. Have you read anything at all about it?

A. No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you a member of the Board?

A. No, sir, I am Secretary of the Ontario Association and also on the staff of the College.

MR. HILL: In your opinion, then, if any Member brings any Bill into this House he is liable to be getting paid for it?

A. I did not catch your question.

Q. You think any Member that is bringing a Bill in this House, the same as Mr. Murphy did, the chances are that he is being paid for his work?

A. I do not say that, but within an hour of being before the Committee, being before the Board, that he comes here and presents the Bill, I think it is a logical conclusion.

MR. SMITH: We at least know that is what you would do.

MR. WILSON: Cannot you quite imagine a Member of the Legislature who is a lawyer finding that the exercise of authority by a Board before whom he appears is so unreasonable and arbitrary that it need legislative correction?

A. I think possible it would add to the powers of the Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: At all events the conclusions you draw are purely inferential because he was defending these men before the Board in the fraud cases?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is your sole reason for thinking it applies?

A. Yes, I have no positive proof of it.

MR. MURPHY: You sent out a letter on March 10th, did you not, to the optometrists?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Did you know that was libelous that letter you sent out?

A. No.

Q. Let us find out your keen interest in this Optometry Bill. You are a member of this College?

A. I am on the staff.

Q. And as a result of this legislation no doubt your remunerations has become, we might say, considerably improved?

A. Not a bit.

Q. Is that right?

A. Not a bit. I was teaching on the staff of the Technical School several years ago and have been continuous—

Q. And you are teaching at the College of Optometry now?

A. I am.

Q. Not at the Technical School?

A. Not at the Technical School.

Q. So that this Bill is of some interest to you to maintain it as it now stands, is not that right?

A. Not a bit.

Q. Let us read this letter of yours:

"This Bill has as its object the repealing of the 1931 amendments which put teeth into The Optometry Act and made it possible for the Board to act against the Mail Order Spectacle Houses and the Bait Advertisers who have for so long been strangling Optometry and misleading the public."

Is that right?

A. That is quite correct.

Q. "Edward J. Murphy, M.P.P., the sponsor of this new Bill, has for the past three days been actively engaged as counsel for the defence in the charges of misrepresentation, fraud, etc., brought by the Board of Examiners against members of the Ritholz Optical Company." Is that right?

A. Yes.

"This same Company has been trading under many names including New Way Optical Company, Self Test Optical Company, and Tru Sight Optical Company. Don't you recognize them?"

"If Mr. Murphy's Bill is not thrown out there is no doubt but that the many activities of this Chicago outfit will be increased a hundredfold, its mail order advertising will go unchecked; it will undoubtedly establish stores with their accompanying faults and misrepresentative advertising in every city and town in Ontario."

A. I believe that.

Q. These people are in competition with you, are they not?

A. I would not say that.

Q. Are they in competition in Toronto with you?

A. No, sir.

Q. You are an optometrist?

A. Yes, but I am not paid—

Q. You are a merchandiser?

A. I am an optometrist.

Q. You sell glasses?

A. If you ask me if a dentist is a merchandiser I will say I am in the same position as a dentist.

Q. You are not in any position like a dentist is, you did not go to college. Is this Bill, the promotion of the repeal of The Optometry Act—you are opposed to it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Because as a matter of fact it in some way enhances your business?

A. Not a bit, but it belittles optometry.

Q. You want the thing kept on a high level, with individuals like yourself, and eliminate competition, is not that right?

A. It is not a question of eliminating competition, it is the elimination of fake advertising and fraud.

Q. Apparently from what we learned before the Board, these people are doing a better business than some of the rest?

A. I have not the slightest idea, and another thing—

Q. "Get busy with your M.P.P. and have him voice his absolute objection to the Murphy Bill. It means Optometry or Ritholtz—Get busy."

Q. That is in your letter?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that you were going to lobby the Legislature against the repeal of The Optometry Act?

A. We would try to persuade Members to see reasonable things.

Q. And then you put: "Excerpt from stenographic report made by Court Stenographer at Inquiry *re* employees of Ritholz Optical Company before the Board of Examiners in Optometry, on March 9th, 1933"—a report about what Mr. Waldron said at the investigation, incorporated that in your letter?

A. I did, the same thing was published in the daily papers.

EXHIBIT "5": Letter dated March 10th, 1933.

Q. Do you know, witness, that was not published in the daily papers until what date?

A. Until the same date that this letter went out.

Q. The same date that the letter went out it was published in the papers?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say it is an excerpt from stenographic report—did you get it from the papers or from the stenographic report?

A. I got it from the stenographic report.

Q. Why did you say it was published in the papers?

A. It was published in the papers.

MR. WILSON: Did you send it to the papers?

A. No, I did not send it to the papers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions?

MR. WALDRON: No, I am not taking any part in the examination of these witnesses.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you did of Mr. Cassels.

MR. WALDRON: Oh, he is from the other side.

MR. SMITH: I understood this witness was asked and he said in answer that he knew nothing about any payments to Mr. Murphy.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, all he is drawing is the inference that Mr. Waldron has.

I. A. HUMPHRIES, K.C., sworn. Examined by MR. MURPHY:

Q. I wrote you a letter on the 25th of January, do you remember receiving it?

A. Yes, I remember receiving a letter from you, Mr. Murphy, but I do not know the exact date.

Q. Asking that Mr. Summers, who made application to the Optometry Board, asking for his reinstatement?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you remember that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And do you remember seeing a Mr. Thompson, Secretary of the Board, at some later date?

A. In reference to it?

Q. Yes?

A. Yes.

Q. What did Mr. Thompson tell you about it?

A. I believe that Mr. Summers had made an application to be reinstated as an optometrist and I think the Board had made some adjudication upon his case which was not very favourable to Mr. Summers. I think they decided that Mr. Summers would have to pass another examination before he would be allowed to come in, and when I received your letter in connection with the matter I communicated with Mr. Thompson and asked him to come over and see me, which he did, and I asked him what the report was and he told me that the Board had decided that Mr. Summers would require to pass another examination. Then I think I wrote a letter to Mr. Thompson and to the Board.

Q. By the way, do you recollect you and I had had a conversation on the phone between that—you communicated what Mr. Thompson had told you to me?

A. Yes, I think I did, Mr. Murphy, and I suggested to Mr. Thompson that this man's case should be reviewed and I believe I wrote a letter to Mr. Thompson and the Board suggesting that this case should be reviewed.

Q. Do you remember what you informed me, that Mr. Thompson said that he had disapproved of the Board's action in the Summers' case?

A. Well, I think Mr. Thompson told me that Mr. Summers at one time had been a student of the Technical School and he had also passed his final examination from the College some years ago and he had practised for a short while, for quite awhile—I don't know how long now—and then he ceased from practising optometry and that now he wanted reinstatement because he had a position which he could go to, he had a job in other words and he wanted to be reinstated and get his certificate so that he could practice again.

Q. And they wanted him to write these examinations over again?

A. And they wanted him to write the examinations over again and I told Mr. Thompson that I did not think that was just right, that my opinion was that they were asking this man to do too much.

Q. Like asking you to write your law examination over again when you are out of law for a number of years?

A. Yes, like asking a man to write his law examinations over again, and if I remember correctly Mr. Thompson agreed with it.

Q. Do you know that since this row I put up in connection with this Summers man, Summers has received his license?

A. Yes, I believe that is right.

Q. Do you remember me calling you some time last year, once in June and once in October about a man named Bennett?

A. Yes, he lived in Oshawa.

Q. You remember me calling you and in no uncertain terms denouncing the Optometry Board. I do not want you to use the language because it might not be just fit for the ear of the Committee.

A. Sometimes you use rather good language when you are talking to me in my office.

Q. But I mean over the phone, particularly in connection with these individuals and in connection with this class legislation—do you remember that—and saying I was going to repeal the Act back in June and October of 1932, about the Barnett case? Do you remember when he had to write the second examination in November or October of 1932?

A. I remember the Barnett case and it was reviewed by our Department and in the Barnett case we found that the discretion that had been exercised by the Board had been properly exercised and that Barnett before he should go out to the public really should pass some further examination. I would not like to say, Mr. Murphy, I remember any remarks of yours at that time that you proposed to repeal the Bill or not; I would not go that far.

Q. You do not remember the conversation over the phone?

A. No.

MR. MURPHY: You are Mr. Waldron's witness.

MR. WALDRON: He is not my witness. I did not say that.

MR. MURPHY: I beg your pardon, he is your witness.

MR. WALDRON: He is not.

MR. MURPHY: He is.

THE CHAIRMAN: We need not have any argument about that.

THE WITNESS: Does not matter to me, I would just as soon be Mr. Waldron's witness.

MR. MURPHY: Your name was put in by Mr. Waldron. Do you know at any time, any place, anywhere, that any money was paid to me to promote repeal of The Optometry Act that was put on the Legislature table this year?

A. No.

Q. Have you got any books to establish any such statements?

A. No.

MR. SMITH: Or any other payment to Mr. Murphy in connection with that Act?

A. No, I know nothing whatever about that.

MR. WILSON: Have you any letters that suggest it or anything?

A. No. I am quite willing to produce any letters we have on the file there for the Committees. Nothing was ever mentioned in any letter I received or the Department received that Mr. Murphy was getting any money for any Bill.

MR. WALDRON: Nobody suggests that.

THE WITNESS: I do not think that was suggested.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Waldron suggests it—he is “Nobody” of course because he says “Nobody” suggested it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. J. C. M. German here?

MR. CASSELS: They have tried to get Mr. German downtown and he is not there. Someone telephoned to his house and they said that he might possibly be in Welland as his father is very ill, and I was going to ask you, sir, if I could telephone over or have someone to telephone over and arrange to have him brought right over.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think we will have to adjourn this hearing until Friday morning, there are so many other pressing matters here.

MR. WILSON: Should we not hear from Mr. Murphy, that is, give Mr. Murphy a chance to make a statement?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Brown is here, too. Brown is the man who brought Summers in because Sommers lived in the riding, and then I saw him.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you like to call Mr. Brown?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

HAROLD C. BROWN, sworn. Examined by MR. MURPHY:

Q. What is your position with the Ritholz Canadian Company?

A. Sales Manager and Office Manager of Ritholz Optical Company, Limited.

Q. Now, you know that I was retained by Mr. Cassels in this matter?

A. By Mr. Cassels.

Q. I did not see you about it?

A. No.

Q. You brought Summers into my office some time in the forepart of January?

A. I went up with Summers.

MR. WALDRON: Please ask the questions properly. If you want to give evidence—

MR. MURPHY: Well, I have listened to you that I get so tired of you that I want to give some myself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think, Mr. Murphy, give the witness a little break. Go ahead.

MR. MURPHY: Now, explain to the Committee what took place and what prompted you to bring Summers to my office?

A. Mr. Summers had been in the employment of the company I am associated with for about a week and I asked him if he had his certificate renewed with the Optometry Board for that year and he said that he had not and he would need to get reinstated as his certificate had not been renewed for the year before, and so I told him he had better hurry up and do it, as there is a fine for not having your certificate renewed in time. Now, I do not remember whether Mr. Cassels got in touch with the Board right then or not but I rather think that he did and he reported back to me. Yes, he did. Mr. Summers told that he had got in touch with the Board and that they had told him it would be necessary to write an examination before they would give him reinstatement and he was very much concerned about it for the reason that it meant losing his position if he could not get reinstatement because under The Optometry Act it is an offence to practice optometry without having license in good standing. We discussed the matter for some time and thought it would be better to try and get Mr. Summers, see if he could not get some help in this matter, some redress, because it meant him being out of a job and he had been out for some months and we discussed the names of two or three lawyers in the city who might take up the matter for him. One of the names I had in mind was in fact Mr. Waldron, because I remember reading in the paper that Mr. Waldron had acted for some dentists before another combine, the Dental Association. I thought of two or three and Mr. Murphy's name as well. Mr. Murphy's name was familiar to Mr. Summers, I believe he is the Member for the riding Mr. Summers lived in, and so went down, made appointment at Mr. Murphy's office, phoned the girl in the office.

MR. WALDRON: Did you go?

A. Yes, I accompanied Mr. Summers and went down to Mr. Murphy's office and Mr. Summers interested Mr. Murphy in his case.

MR. MURPHY: Any suggestion of any money being paid for what was done for Summers by you or by Summers or any person else?

A. No suggestion of money in it at all.

Q. Then when did I next see you?

A. The morning of the day the Board—March 6th.

Q. From the time in January until the morning of March 6th, the morning this matter came up before the Board, I had not seen you in the interval?

A. No.

Q. And is there money being paid to Mr. Cassels' firm or to me, any money to promote the repeal of The Optometry Act?

A. No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions by the Committee, gentlemen?

MR. WALDRON: You took Mr. Summers down in the month of January, was it?

A. Yes.

Q. And stayed throughout the interview?

A. Yes.

Q. And you went to a solicitor, one of the leading counsel of the city, and what did you say to him about paying for the service which he would perform?

A. There was no mention of pay for the service whatsoever.

Q. But you expected to pay?

A. I expected there would be some payment to be made.

Q. By you?

A. Not necessarily.

Q. But probably by you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Payment to whom?

MR. WALDRON: To Mr. Murphy?

A. There was no expectation of payment to Mr. Murphy.

Q. Why, was not he the man in your employ, was not he the man whom you were using in your business—did not you need him and did not you need to defend your company against—

A. My company was not involved in any way whatsoever.

Q. It was?

A. No, I have known Mr. Summers for some years and I was interested in Mr. Summers personally, I was trying to do as much for him personally as I could.

Q. And that at that time did you not contemplate that the Board might stop Mr. Summers working for you because he was not certified?

A. Naturally, if a man is not licensed.

Q. Well, now, then, was any bill rendered to you?

A. No.

Q. No bill rendered to you?

A. No.

Q. Any bill rendered that you know of to Chicago?

A. No, not that I know of.

Q. Have you any correspondence with Chicago about the Bill now standing in the House?

A. One letter came asking me to send them a copy of the Bill that they had seen reported in the newspapers and I had sent them the newspapers, everything pertinent—

Q. You had kept the company in Chicago advised as to what was going on here?

A. The members or, rather, the employees of the company were under attack by the Optometry Board and I kept my company advised.

Q. You kept them advised as to the progress of the Bill?

A. I think it was mentioned once.

Q. And you wrote about it once in a letter, did you?

A. No.

Q. Well, would you produce your letter in which you sent these things?

A. We simply sent the clipping; there was no letter.

Q. There was no accompanying letter?

A. No.

Q. Did they send you back a letter in reply which you have?

A. Yes, I should have it on file.

Q. Will you produce it?

A. Yes.

Q. Who is the leading persons in Ritholz?

A. There are three brothers.

Q. B., M. I. Ritholz—

A. I don't know his first name.

Q. That is Moses Isaac—

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that his correct name, Mr. Waldron?

MR. WALDRON: I don't know, I am only guessing.

MR. WALDRON: Who is the third one?

A. S. J.

Q. And they own the business here?

A. They are directors of the company.

Q. I did not ask you that—they own the business here?

A. Well, there are probably other owners, they are three of the owners.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know who owns the business?

A. I don't know how many shareholders there are in the business; I am not a shareholder myself.

Q. These men are three directors?

A. Yes.

Q. That is the extent of your knowledge of ownership?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. WALDRON: Have any of them been over here lately?

A. Not within a year.

Q. Do you know Dominic Lazarus?

A. No, I do not.

Q. I ask you this question: I was personally shown by the Chairman of the Board of Optometry a telegram—

MR. MURPHY: Just a moment, all the nonsense—my learned friend has to laugh because it is nonsense—a telegram was received during the hearing of the Optometry Board—no doubt sent by themselves or some person in their interests and they are going to bring this in—Dominic Lazarus I mean, you better get Lazarus up.

MR. WALDRON: This telegram was sent to Mr. Barnes and it asks Mr. Barnes—

THE CHAIRMAN: Has this anything to do with the Bill, Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURPHY: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it has not we have no time to hear it. If you say, Mr. Waldron, it is pertinent to this enquiry I will let you ask the question but if it is not we really have not time.

MR. WALDRON: I think it could not be connected up by any evidence to Mr. Murphy, only to show the character of the men for whom this gentleman works.

MR. SMITH: They are not on trial.

MR. MURPHY: There was no character involved—it was a fictitious telegram.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Murphy, do you want to say anything yourself?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I am prepared to say anything. I might say too much, that is all. What is the Committee going to do after this matter is over? I would like to wind this thing up to-day. I do not want my name bandied around town in connection with Mr. Waldron, to be honest.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the Committee up to this time are quite satisfied that any statement which Mr. Waldron made and which is set forth in the notes which are filed as an exhibit, are printed in part in the Star and other newspapers, that in making that statement that in his belief you were paid to promote this Bill, all he had in mind to substantiate that belief was the fact that you had been engaged or retained by Mr. Cassels to defend certain people before the Optometry Board. I think all of the evidence this morning would indicate that that is the ground and the only ground that Mr. Waldron had for making the statement. Unless Mr. Waldron has some further evidence that he would like to make, I

think the admissions already made, the evidence now in, is quite clear that that is the only evidence that anybody has to offer or suggest—if one would call it that—because you acted as counsel at the request of Mr. Cassels that, therefore, when you subsequently introduced the Bill complained of you were paid to so introduce or promote it.

MR. WALDRON: Not “subsequently.” The hearing began on the 6th, the Bill was read the first time on the 6th and filed, some step was taken a few days before.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just to probably curtail the time of the Committee, let us all know where we are at—the only reason you have for suggesting that Mr. Murphy has been paid and is guilty of breach of The Legislative Assembly Act is because he was retained by Mr. Cassels to defend these people before the Board.

MR. WALDRON: I think you were stating accurately, sir, that that was all that was in my mind, at that moment.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that the question really resolves itself down for consideration by the Committee—were you justified on those facts to make the statement you have. Now, that will be a matter for the Committee to consider. We have your statement read at length and explained by yourself and I am quite sure that the Committee understands the position you take and will pass upon the case which you have submitted, unless you want to call further witnesses, and unless you can go further than we are all now agreed upon I do not see any reason for prolonging the life of the Committee unless you have got some further evidence than what you state and admit and what we are all generally agreed upon, I do not see any further reason for prolonging the life of the Committee. I do not mean that the Committee won't consider both sides of the case, but I am glad that you have made it so clear that the facts as I referred to are the only facts you have in mind.

MR. WALDRON: The only facts I had in mind and anything I got after that would be such as one would look for who is seeking to defend himself from attack. I am content if the matter rests right there. I am willing to be tried, if you choose, upon the issue as I have stated. That is, as you have stated accurately—that is to say, that I concluded from Mr. Murphy's presence while he was promoting the Bill that he had been paid, and I rest then upon the reason which I have set out in my statement which I read and if the Committee does not bother me any more I have not any bother.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any statement to make now, Mr. Murphy?

MR. TAYLOR: Might I ask Mr. Waldron just at this point: Do I gather the inference, then, that should this Committee see fit to in some manner, according to their duties, pass sentence on you, then you are prepared to go further to defend yourself.

MR. WALDRON: That would be a fair thing to ask me to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, Mr. Taylor, the Committee's position is this:

The House has referred this matter to this Committee to enquire into the charges as stated by Mr. Waldron when he said:

"If you ask me seriously to state my serious conviction I would say that I think he is being paid to promote that Bill, and in so doing breaks a fundamental law of the country and exposes himself to, I think, criminal prosecution."

Now, it is our duty to enquire into this matter, to report to the House, and there cannot be any doubt as to Mr. Waldron's position before this Committee, for he says in effect: Gentlemen, because Mr. Murphy was engaged or retained by Mr. Cassels as a lawyer acting for certain men and because subsequently he introduced the Bill—

MR. WALDRON: Not "subsequently."

THE CHAIRMAN: The Bill was before that, and because at the same time he introduced a Bill therefore his service and his pay acting before the Board were connected with the introduction or promotion of the Bill.

MR. WALDRON: Put it accurately—the receipt or acceptance indirectly of a fee or reward.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that there can be no dispute. Mr. Waldron does not charge that he directly received anything for introducing or promoting the Bill, that the pay that he retained would be indirectly as counsel acting before the Optometry Board at the request of Mr. Cassels.

MR. WILSON: How about Mr. Waldron's statement earlier in the day—and any opinion or surmise or inference or anything else—but he made bald statement under oath that Mr. Murphy was paid to promote this Bill. He made that statement. He went further than that and he said that he would and could produce a witness before this Committee who would make that statement under oath, that Mr. Murphy was paid to promote it. Now, I do not think in justice to Mr. Murphy that we should leave that up in the air.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Waldron can state his position in reference to that. You heard what Mr. Smith said—that in addition to the inference which was to be drawn, that you intimated this morning that you had a witness—

MR. WALDRON: When I came in this morning I laid upon your table a list of the witnesses whom I wished you to call, believing or expecting that the prosecution of me might go on to the end. I thought it was your duty to retain that; I thought you did wrong in driving me, and Mr. Smith participated in it, in driving me to state whether I had any witness. You had no right to do that, and in the course of that discussion, thinking of that witness whom I had in mind on that paper had said about certain details, that I thought there was a witness who might give some evidence as to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are suggesting now that you have not that witness.

MR. WALDRON: I do not think that I have any witness who can say that

Mr. Murphy received any other money than this \$200, for the promotion of that Bill. I do not want to say what the witness would say. You should not have done that. I did not want to prosecute Mr. Murphy; I did not want to hurt him.

MR. WILSON: You have made a very good attempt.

MR. WALDRON: I made a very good attempt when you drive me.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can take this as fair—that if you indicated that you had another witness you now want to withdraw from that position, that you have no witness that can give any testimony to this Committee that Mr. Murphy got any money or any pay other than the \$200, which he tells himself, as a retainer fee from Mr. Cassels. That is your position.

MR. WALDRON: I think that the witness whom I would call, of whom I speak, would not say that—he would say that Mr. Murphy received a sum of money; he would not say that that was the money, that that was paid for the purpose of promoting that Bill. That might develop I thought—I do not say it would—I thought it might develop out of the other evidence; that is, that they would be connected. I did not assert it; I don't know.

MR. WILSON: If it is not asserted it is not before the Committee. I understood you were asserting it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then we can after that explanation, gentlemen—

MR. MURPHY: These are kind of statements that my learned friend makes. My learned friend was proven this morning by his statement to be a liar before the Committee by the production of this witness.

MR. WALDRON: Now.

MR. MURPHY: No, that is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we can get along without getting into language of that sort and I would rather that we did. It is quite clear to the Committee now that Mr. Waldron has not had and has not now any evidence to justify the statement that you have been paid to introduce this Bill except the inference he draws that because you acted in your professional capacity, being retained by Mr. Cassels, in appearing before the Optometry Board, was what he means paid under the circumstances. I think the Committee, after Mr. Waldron's statement of the evidence, is quite clear on that point, and it will be for the Committee to consider the question in their report to the House as to whether Mr. Waldron in making the statement he has was, as he asserts, within his legal rights, because it was in a court or whether the circumstances in this case, involving you as a Member of the House, he had any right to make the statement. That will be all included as far as we are able to report to the House. Gentlemen, I think I am expressing the view of the Committee that it is quite clear there is no suggestion of payment to Mr. Murphy to promote the Bill except whatever inference one may wish to draw as asserted by Mr. Waldron, that because he was retained in a professional capacity, that inference could be drawn. Under the circumstances I do not think

there is any need of summoning further witnesses. I do not think there is need of holding a further Committee meeting, and I think the House can await our Report.

MR. SMITH: I think we should just add to what you said, Sir—as far as I am concerned I would say in my opinion there is no evidence of any impropriety on the part of Mr. Murphy, that so far as the evidence here is concerned, that he did nothing that he was not entitled to do as a member of the Bar or as a Member of the Legislature or as a private citizen.

MR. WILSON: I certainly would agree with that.

MR. HILL: That is right—that is in my mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would the Committee like to consider it?

MR. TAYLOR: I think the suggestion of the Chairman that the House await Report is quite sufficient, that we would like to consider it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any member of the Committee may express his opinion if he wishes. The evidence has all to be transcribed, we have to bring in Report and we can make our findings.

MR. TWEED: I thought the evidence was to be submitted to the House.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will accompany the Report. This Committee stands adjourned to meet at the call of the Chair. Our Report will be considered and we will have a further meeting to wind it up.

EXHIBIT "6." Copy of Mail & Empire dated March 15th, 1933.

Adjourned at 1.50 p.m.

APPENDIX No. 3

Report and Minutes of the Meetings of the Committee
on Fish and Game

Session of 1933

No. 3

Report of the Committee on Fish and Game 1933

SESSION OF 1933

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

GENTLEMEN:

The Standing Committee on Fish and Game begs leave to present to the House the Minutes of their meetings during the current Session and recommend that they be printed as an appendix to the Journals of the House.

COULTER McLEAN,
Vice-Chairman.

April 13th, 1933.

Minutes of the Committee on Fish and Game

February 28th, 1933.

The meeting was held for organization purposes only, the following members of the Committee being present:—

T. H. Bell, M.P.P.; Hon. W. D. Black; W. J. Bragg, M.P.P.; Hon. Geo. H. Challies; H. S. Colliver, M.P.P.; H. J. Davis, M.P.P.; W. H. Elliott, M.P.P.; G. V. Harcourt, M.P.P.; J. F. Hill, M.P.P.; E. Hutchinson, M.P.P.; W. H. Ireland, M.P.P.; T. W. Jutten, M.P.P.; A. J. Kennedy, M.P.P.; A. F. Kenning, M.P.P.; T. P. Lancaster, M.P.P.; F. V. Laughton, M.P.P.; Hon. J. Lyons, M.P.P.; C. McLean, M.P.P.; T. A. Murphy, M.P.P.; T. P. Murray, M.P.P.; W. Newman, M.P.P.; Hon. P. Poisson, M.P.P.; C. E. Raven, M.P.P.; D. M. Ross, M.P.P.; J. A. Sanderson, M.P.P.; W. W. Staples, M.P.P.; J. F. Strickland, M.P.P.

On motion by Mr. Ireland, seconded by Mr. Laughton, Mr. Ecclestone was elected as Chairman and Mr. McLean as Vice-Chairman.

The Honourable Mr. Challies in his opening remarks welcomed the members back to their deliberations on matters pertaining to fish and game.

He drew attention to requests and suggestions he had received that the Committee should meet on definite dates, notice of which should be announced, together with whatever advice it was possible to give as to the nature of the representations which would be heard, and if possible, the Committee on such dates should sit through and hear the representations of associations and individuals, particularly those who come from a distance, thus avoiding any disappointment of these parties and suggested that, with the co-operation of the Chairman, it would be possible to arrange for meetings on consecutive dates which could be conducted along the lines of such a suggestion, and thus provide additional consideration for the interested public. In view of the early organization of this Committee it might be possible to hear these representations and to have time to give consideration to the same without in any way interfering with the deliberations of other Legislative Committees.

He referred to the activities of the Department during the past year and advised of the fact that the Special Game Committee had completed its work, presented their report and that the report was now in the hands of the printer and should soon be available for distribution. Nothing of outstanding importance had developed during the year. He made mention of the introduction of elk and their establishment at Petawawa and gave details as to numbers, the minimum expense which was involved in securing the animals and the co-operation which had been so willingly afforded by the Federal National Parks Branch in this project. He stated that this experiment was a success and would be further developed by completing arrangements to bring additional stock of these animals for location in other areas and referred particularly to Burwash, where arrangements are now being undertaken to provide enclosure for two carloads of these animals. It is anticipated that the overflow from these herds will find their way

into adjoining areas and thus be responsible, in time, for adding this species to game animals which it is possible to hunt in this Province. Continuing further, he stated that it was rather regrettable that in Eastern Ontario, that is, Renfrew, Addington, Hastings, Haliburton and even Muskoka, there was not in the jurisdiction of the Department property sufficiently extensive for use in the development of this experiment in this particular section, as in the opinion of the Department it was essential just now to keep the animals within the confines of game preserve enclosures and as they propagate in future, allow the surplus their liberty in adjoining section.

The open season provided for pheasants was a matter of importance. The viewpoint of the Department was that they would seek information from associations and members of associations where it was thought desirable to provide such an open season, as to their reaction to the advisability of taking such action as well as securing their advice as to the number of days, bag limits and so forth. If there is any criticism, the Department will accept that, but from the area in which the vast percentage of criticism developed, there was the least co-operation with the Department in the matter of supplying the information which had been sought. However, it was the opinion that so far as the hunter was concerned, he had been given an opportunity to get something on his gun license which he takes out every year, and in any event, the pheasants, both eggs and live birds, are distributed to the public on the distinct understanding that they are under the control of the Department, and the Department felt that it had some right to consider the hunter.

It was further stated that the Department would be pleased to co-operate in every way possible in keeping the Province on its splendid footing and that it had been a pleasure to administer the Department, because of the splendid foundation laid by the Honourable Mr. McCrea in looking after the fish and game resources of the Province.

Further remarks had reference to the establishment and opening of the Trout Rearing Station at Dorion, Thunder Bay District, at which point it was anticipated it would be possible to conduct operations with respect to the propagation of speckled trout from the egg to the fingerling stage, with an annual capacity ranging between one and two millions. This hatchery with its tanks and ponds is the last word in speckled trout rearing on this continent and it should be a splendid thing for that end of the Province. It is anticipated that one result would be that as a matter of government policy, it would be possible to put the Nipigon River, which is world famous for its speckled trout fishing, on an equal footing with other waters of the Province by abolishing the present system of license fees operative in these waters, notwithstanding the extensive angling operations which are conducted therein.

Attention was drawn to this particular contrast which now required non-residents to pay \$10.00 for a week's fishing and residents to pay \$5.00 for two weeks' fishing in Nipigon waters. It was expected that any extra fishing of these waters which might follow the adoption of this measure would not deplete the supply of speckled trout, having in mind the background of the Dorion Trout Rearing Station.

Following a general suggestion that two consecutive dates should be estab-

lished when it would be possible to hear representations from associations and individuals, Mr. Bell inquired as to the possibility of setting these dates to a time after the report of the Special Game Committee had been made available, so that associations would have an opportunity to submit representations based on recommendations of the Special Committee.

Honourable Mr. Challies drew attention to the possibility of undue delay which might follow the adoption of such a course, and intimated that it should be possible to hear the present representations of these associations, deliberate upon them and if after the Special Committee Report was available, any intimation was received that associations desired to make further representations in the light of the Committee recommendations, satisfactory arrangements to provide an additional date for this purpose could be completed.

After a general discussion of this matter in which several members of the Committee participated and during which Mr. Bell moved that the Minister be respectfully requested to endeavour to have the report of the Special Game Committee on hand at as early a date as possible so that the information therein contained would be available to associations and organizations as well as the members of the Fish and Game Committee, and which motion was seconded by Mr. Collier, it was finally agreed that the matter of arranging dates for hearing by delegates from associations as well as individuals be left to the discretion of the Chairman acting in conjunction with the Minister.

The meeting then adjourned on motion of Mr. Ireland.

SECOND MEETING

March 15th, 1933.

The Committee met at 10.00 a.m.

The following members of the Committee were in attendance: Mr. McLean, Vice-Chairman, and Messrs. Acres, Aubin, Bell, Black, Bragg, Calder, Challies, Collier, Davis, Elliott (Rainy River), Graham, Graves, Hambly, Harcourt, Harrison, Henry (East Kent), Hill, Hutchinson, Ireland, Jutten, Kennedy (Temiskaming), Kenning, Lancaster, Laughton, Lyons, McNaughton, Murray, Newman, Oliver, Poisson, Raven, Reid, Robertson, Sanderson, Sangster, Seguin, Skinner, Spence, Stedman, Taylor, Vaughan, Willson (Niagara Falls), Wilson (Lincoln).

In his opening remarks, the Minister in charge of the Game and Fisheries Department, Honourable Mr. Challies, first introduced Mr. McLean in his capacity as Chairman, to those present at the meeting, stating that Mr. Ecclestone who had at the first meeting of the Committee been appointed Chairman, was at present absent from the House, and that Mr. McLean would act in this capacity for the meeting. He further expressed his pleasure to recognize so many familiar faces present and reiterated the arrangement which had been adopted at the first meeting, in view of the request which had been received to sit through until the evening, if necessary, to hear the representations of those present who desired to be heard, but suggested that remarks should be concise and restricted, as far

as possible, to the recommendations to be presented so that it might be possible to hear all who had any observations to submit, and especially those who had come from a distance.

It was further explained that the Committee was provided to enable the presentation of suggestions and recommendations and, while it is not always possible for the Minister to attend the several meetings, this was attributable to the multifarious duties requiring attention and should not be construed in any unfavourable light.

He referred to the fact that the Report of the Special Game Committee had been presented to the House, printed and made available for distribution, and while references thereto might necessarily have to be made by the visitors, the object to be borne in mind was that they were present to make representations on behalf of propagation and conservation of wild life, and suggestions and constructive criticism along these lines will be welcomed.

Mr. McLean stated that all points had been very well covered in the remarks of the Honourable Mr. Challies and emphasized the request that those addressing the meeting be as brief as possible, consistent with the matters they desired to bring to the attention of members of the Committee. He assured the meeting that they all realized that the hunters are real conservationists, and while they were interested in hunting, they were also interested in protecting and propagating the game life, and many helpful suggestions had been forthcoming in the past. Requested that their suggestions be laid before the Committee so that it would be possible to summarize them and bring them in the form of a recommendation from the Committee to the Minister for the necessary action.

Mr. Castle, President of the Ontario Hunters' Game Protective Association, presented a list of sixteen recommendations of this association. In doing so, he referred to the fact that they were not a local organization, but, practically speaking, embraced pretty well the whole Province, and stated that they were very much in favour of, and would support, commonsense fair play for the protection of game, fish and birds as a provincial asset, as our wild life was worth more to the Province, both at present and in the future, than the average citizen is liable to give credit for. Had noted with pleasure the early presence at the meeting of the Honourable Mr. Challies, which he believed was an evidence of appreciation of the co-operation which they desired to provide.

Mr. Robinson, Middlesex Hunters' Game Protective Association, stated their association endorsed the resolutions of the Ontario Hunters' Association, as presented. We are down to-day especially on the dog question, but that will be discussed later. Spoke in support of Resolution No. 1, which suggests the institution in the schools of the Province of an education campaign in the matter of the conservation of the wild life of the Province. Their support of the resolution was attributable to their desire to see and assist in the conservation of game in the Province.

Mr. Castle: Concerning Resolution No. 2, which suggests that a licensee should be required to make a return of his take, he believed that in this way it would be possible to assemble information which would be of considerable value to the Department in its work.

Mr. McLean observed that this was a question which had been dealt with by the Special Game Committee in their report.

As to Resolution No. 3, which favours the establishment of a Province-wide gun license to be issued at an annual fee of \$1.00, Mr. McLean stated this also was a matter which was the subject of a recommendation by the Special Game Committee, though he was not sure as to whether any fee was recommended.

Mr. Hunsberry, Past President, Ontario Hunters' Game Protective Association, reviewed existing legislation respecting the gun license, first action covering four counties being taken in 1926. Recalled his original request and suggestion that a \$1.00 fee should be imposed, and that *bona fide* farmers should be able to secure such licenses for 25c., and his astonishment when the fee was announced as \$2.00. Would not have sponsored the suggestion had he had any idea that the license was not to be made Province-wide. Such a license would be of great benefit in that it would assist the Game Overseers in the performance of their duties. He believed that if figures were available in comparison with previous year, a considerable reduction would be observed in the number of such licenses which were issued in 1932. In these times, many sportsmen and farmers cannot afford the money for this license. This fee, as now charged, is in excess of that charged for similar licenses in adjoining states. Opposed to license unless it is Province-wide, and supports the resolution for such action and reduction of fee to \$1.00. In his opinion it was class legislation and is causing antagonism amongst the farmers against the hunter and against the Government. He believed it was a question which required careful consideration on the part of the Committee, as there was a lot of resentment all through the Province against the law and especially in that part of the Province where it now applies.

Resolution No. 5 asked increase in wolf bounty to \$40.00. In this connection, Mr. McLean quoted amount of bounties paid in provinces and states adjoining Ontario, and while action along the lines of the resolution might result in attempts to collect bounty on illicit pelts, he believed that Ontario would continue to lead the way in the matter of wolf bounty.

Mr. Moody, Past President of the Ontario Hunters' Association, suggested that Resolution No. 5, which advocates increase in fee for non-resident hunting licenses, be left to the Committee for decision.

Resolution No. 6 would prohibit use of ferrets and sale of cottontail rabbits in the present gun license area. Mr. W. R. Griner, Aldershot, supported the resolution in view of the fact that rabbits and hares offered the principal sport for those who secured gun licenses, and cited instances where excessive numbers of rabbits had been taken by those using ferrets for this purpose.

Mr. Castle urged consideration of Resolution No. 7, which suggests that for purposes of fish and game protection, Algonquin Park should be placed under the jurisdiction of the Game and Fisheries Department. Mr. McLean stated that this was a matter referred to in the Report of the Special Game Committee and possibly would be discussed by the Committee, and that different officials interested could get together.

Resolution No. 8 contained suggestions as to hunting of water-fowl. Mr.

E. J. Hughes of Trout Mills, speaking with reference to this, stated that while the recommendations might be desirable, until there was evidence of similar action in adjoining provinces and states, consideration should be withheld.

Mr. Castle spoke briefly in support of the resolution.

Mr. Moody would not impose the restrictions proposed by the resolution.

Mr. Grigg of Renfrew, speaking of conditions as they existed along the Ottawa River, on the Quebec side, and the Regulations as they applied in that Province, was opposed to the resolution.

Mr. I. J. Russell of Waubausheene was in favour of the open season on migratory birds, commencing September 15th, in so far as Georgian Bay waters are concerned.

W. D. Colby, Kent Angling and Hunting Association, spoke in favour of the resolution and stated that their association was opposed to the practice of feeding and baiting ducks. Referred to conditions in Rondeau Harbour which were responsible for heavy toll among ducks. The practice is not approved by the Kent Association and is unsportsmanlike.

Mr. Osler, Toronto: Some effort should be made to avoid the abuses which have been referred to, and which would seem to have been the basis for the present suggestion, without prohibiting something which in some centres is calculated to improve the sport. Feeding in Lake St. Clair waters has been of distinct advantage to all the neighbourhood. Referred to work and activities of the St. Anne Club. He believed that the duck shooting available in that section was in large measure attributable to the protection afforded in the waters of this club, as if they were not spending money to preserve the birds, they would be harried from day to day, and would get no harbourage. My submission to you is that you should consider very carefully first the effect that preserved shootings, which are not too numerous, really only get a very small proportion of the ducks which are preserved, and they are the best foundation for outside shooting. I feel the interests of all are the same and that is to get the largest number of birds preserved and harbouring in this country. Does not know of anything which could be devised but would hesitate providing a general regulation which would prohibit something which is a reasonable and, at present, lawful thing to do.

Mr. Colby stated that he just wanted to correct an impression which Mr. Osler had evidently obtained from his previous remarks. Being familiar with conditions, he was able to state that St. Anne's Club was a distinct asset to duck shooting in general, on Mitchell's Bay and Lake St. Clair, but that it was in Rondeau Harbour and along the shores of Rondeau Provincial Park where the injustice exists.

Mr. Calder, M.P.P., supported what had been said by Mr. Colby. While one of the difficulties encountered in enforcing game and fish laws is the geographic differences which come in and make it difficult to draw up a general law which would be applicable, something requires to be done as to the situation which exists at Rondeau Park.

Mr. C. B. Taylor of St. Thomas thought that the privileges at Rondeau were abused.

Mr. W. R. Griner, Aldershot: Hamilton Bay should be a shooting ground for ducks open to the public. But the practices which have developed now prevent this. Certain hunters have devoted their time to establishing blinds on the north and south shores, and the Hamilton Beach shore, and which blinds are occupied according to existing weather conditions. Such blinds, permanently built in these locations, do not permit the public to shoot on that area. Some regulation should be adopted to take care of this situation.

Resolution No. 11, respecting open season on partridge; Resolution No. 12, respecting distribution of game birds; Resolution No. 13, respecting imposition of penalties by police magistrates; Resolution No. 14, respecting open season on muskrats; Resolution No. 16, respecting destruction of starlings, were left to the consideration of the Committee without any comment.

Resolution No. 15, respecting Deputy Game Wardens and authority to retain badge of office, to be referred to the Department, through the Minister, for consideration.

Mr. Hunsberry spoke in favour of Resolution No. 9, which suggests a close season on rabbits in certain counties, setting forth the farmers' reasons for insisting that his property rights be respected until he has concluded the fall work on his lands. Present provisions of the game laws permit landowners to prohibit trespassing on their property and, as gun licenses are issued prior to September 1st, to enable the duck hunter to carry on his operations, something must be done about closing the season on rabbits.

Mr. E. L. Hughes stated that the Special Game Committee had made a recommendation that in the area defined in Section 7 (a) of the Game Laws, the open season for deer should not commence prior to October 1st. I would like to say that it is impossible to go down the rivers north of the Transcontinental Railway after October 1st.

Mr. Spence, M.P.P., tabled resolutions transmitted to him by the Thunder Bay Protective Association and reserved the privilege of speaking to the resolutions in the Committee.

Dr. Hansen, Niagara Falls: Was of the opinion that as farmers under existing regulations could prohibit trespassing on their lands, the matter of supplying linen notices to farmers for posting their properties was one for consideration by the Department when request for such signs was received.

The Honourable Mr. Chaffies here referred to the matter of trespassing on farmers' property, drawing attention to the fact that licenses issued under the Game Laws distinctly state that they may be used only on property which may be lawfully entered upon. He referred briefly to the provisions of The Criminal Code, The Petty Trespass Act, and Section 61 of the Game Laws which operated on behalf of the farmer in case of trespass and afforded the farmer the protection he required. He stated that the matter of supplying notices, as suggested, was one which would receive attention by the Department.

The Chairman, Mr. McLean, referred to the introduction by the Department of elk for propagating purposes, into the Province, and suggested that the Minister might address the meeting as to the hopes entertained in connection with the introduction of this species into Ontario.

In response to this suggestion, the Minister addressed the meeting in this connection along the lines of the information supplied to the Committee when they met first for organization purposes, making special reference to the further arrangements which were under way to secure additional shipments, and the steps being taken, particularly at Burwash, for the accommodation of these additional animals.

Mr. Elmer Davies of Kingston addressed the meeting in support of the recommendation of the Ontario Hunters' Association, which is in favour of the use of dogs to hunt deer, the following being a brief summary of his remarks:

He first expressed his own appreciation of the presence of the Minister at the meeting. The views which will be presented are those which will be most conducive to the conservation of wild game, not only for ourselves but in the interests of posterity. Out of the discussion there may culminate and be made effective, measures which will be passed for the propagation and protection of game. The report which had been presented by the Special Game Committee showed evidence of the great care, pains and effort which had been put forth by this Committee in their labours, and the Chairman and members of the Committee were entitled to the thanks of the hunters for their painstaking effort in compiling and presenting such an excellent report.

Concerning the depletion of deer, he would like to call the attention of the members of the Committee to the statement in the report as it appears on page 22, where the causes are listed as they are adjudged by the Committee and, briefly set forth, are as follows:

"It must be declared upon the evidence offered to the Committee by settlers, game wardens, hunters and others, that wolves constitute one of the principal destructive forces in our deer districts. Marked responsibility for the steady destruction of our deer herd is laid to the following causes:

1. Slaughter of does and fawns;
2. Licensed hunters;
3. Wolves;
4. Illegal hunting;
5. Starvation in deep snow;
6. Other causes."

And again on page 23:

"So that to-day the wolf problem remains quite as menacing to the deer as ever."

I submit that while the use of dogs in the hunting of deer was not definitely within the purview of the Committee dealing with the past and the causes which have brought about the conditions as they were found, you will note that the

definite conclusion of the Special Committee did not consider that the use of dogs had been a very substantial destructive force in the days past, otherwise it would have been included in that list of causes. I think that this is one thing we should note very definitely in passing.

Concerning the argument that the use of dogs was productive of barren does, occasionally noted in the woods, one member of the Committee gives expression to this statement: "Barren does among deer is not a more common occurrence among these animals than among sheep or kindred animals." I think this explodes, to a considerable degree, that the dog is a destructive force on does during the breeding season.

He thought that one great outstanding feature in the destruction of deer was the wolf and, in substantiation of this, he made the following references to the report of the Special Game Committee, page 17.

"Warden Willmott was convinced of an opinion we had heard from more than a score of observers of the present time, namely, that one wolf could do more damage than many hunters."

Another thing in the report that has a definite bearing on the use of dogs: At page 19 is to be found a summary of the meetings held:

"Recapitulation of our minutes shows that eight meetings pressed the dog question to the vote in favour, one meeting south of the French and Mattawa voted against, whilst at forty-seven meetings, although the matter was debated and dogs strongly favoured, no vote was taken." It is obvious from this report that the Special Game Committee found an overwhelming sentiment in favour of the use of dogs throughout the Province. May I be permitted to repeat why is so much stress laid at the door of the dog, as compared with the wolf?

His objection to the continuation of the present system which prohibited the use of dogs in connection with the hunting of deer included the risk to human life which was involved. He drew attention to the fatalities which had occurred in this Province last season and stated that in the Province of Nova Scotia, twelve deaths had occurred, and that thirty-seven deaths had occurred in three states of the Union, from the same cause. A further objection was the loss of animals, as every hunter knows that the danger of losing wounded deer is vastly greater under the present regulations. Again, there is going to be a decrease in the revenue to the Department. This method of hunting deprives a certain percentage of citizens from the privilege of hunting. These men are not able to get out. The deer are an asset to the whole citizenship of the Province, and no action should be taken which would deprive the aged and the men who have physical limitations of this privilege of hunting.

In view of the Minister's request for constructive suggestions, I would put forward the following for his consideration, and the consideration of the Committee:

In the main, we are agreed with these specific recommendations of the Special Game Committee, under the Chairmanship of the Honourable Mr. Black. Referring to the recommendation that the shooting of does and fawns should be

prohibited, he expressed considerable doubt that such a regulation would be advisable or enforceable in view of the methods which might be adopted for evasion. He was impressed with the alternative suggestion submitted to the Special Game Committee by Dr. Lionel Stevenson (see pages 13 and 14, that the deer license fee be doubled to \$8.00 and where a man shoots a doe, should not be entitled to any refund, but where he shoots a buck and presents his credentials to this effect, refund to such hunter one-half of the fee paid. I would carry this further and make a refund to the man who shoots a buck or to the man who shoots no deer at all.

If it is necessary for the conservation of game, hunters if permitted to use dogs are prepared to pay a higher license fee or a license to have the dog, always provided that the revenue thus secured is used for the destruction of wolves and, therefore, for the propagation of game.

If, in the opinion of the Committee, these methods are not sufficient in the way of conservation, then give us a close season every alternate year.

If these suggestions are adopted, I think we can join forces and add to the stock of deer and, in time, give us an abundance of deer in the Province; nor deprive any citizen, despite his years of physical infirmities, of the privilege to hunt, and we will attain the end which is the common objective of us all, namely increase the stock and the propagation of the deer.

In reply to a question asked by Mr. Newman, M.P.P., Mr. Davis stated that to his knowledge, only once did a member of their hunting party kill a wolf during the hunting season.

Mr. Bennett of Walkerville supported the statements of Mr. Davis and stated further that the deer brought out of their camp last season were all small.

Mr. Castle was in favour of using dogs to hunt deer and a system under which it would be possible to license dogs for this purpose. His experience last year was that small deer were taken. More should be done to exterminate the wolf, and it was his opinion that the poacher was also a real menace to the game, and he hoped that these offenders would be more severely dealt with in an effort to make them obey the law.

Mr. Gregg spoke in support of the use of dogs to hunt deer and a system of licensing such dogs. Speaking with reference to a proposed buck law, he stated that he did not see how such a regulation could be enforced, unless the additional fee as suggested in the course of Mr. Davis' address was imposed. He thought that the feeling throughout the country was that it was wrong to suppress the dogs. He suggested further that the present open season should be put back for a period of five days and thus open in the south on November 10th. While the use of snares had been frowned upon, it was recognized that this was the best method of taking wolves.

Mr. W. D. Colby stated that the Kent Angling and Hunting Association is on record as being in favour of the use of dogs to hunt deer and he was in full accord with what had been put before the meeting in this connection.

Dr. C. B. Taylor, St. Thomas: Stated that he was opposed to the use of dogs for the hunting of deer, and was very enthusiastic about the present regulation. The evidence that such regulation existed in all the Provinces of the Dominion and in most of the States of the Union was sufficient for him that to ban the dog would be a good thing. He did not believe that the use of the dog was a measure of conservation and made the following suggestions: The establishment of a buck law south of the French and Mattawa Rivers; creation of additional sanctuaries placed in strategic positions and close together, if necessary; closing the season in alternate sections; no interference with the open seasons as provided at present.

Mr. James Wilson stated that this was the first meeting of the Committee which he had attended at which the hunters accustomed to using dogs had admitted that the deer were becoming scarcer. He related his own personal experience as to existence of deer in the past years in Muskoka and Parry Sound Districts. He was not interested in the use of dogs and stated that the only way to conserve deer was to establish a buck law and recommended that such a regulation should be brought into effect for a five-year period. He would not penalize the man who inadvertently shot a doe, but would make a provision that such animal should be turned over by the hunter to the Department for disposition. He further suggested an entire close season for a period of three years.

The meeting adjourned at 12.30 p.m.

Reassembling at 4.00 p.m.

The representative from the Middlesex Hunters' Game Protective Association endorsed the use of dogs for the hunting of deer and referred to the petition which is extensively signed, and received from Baysville, which supports the use of dogs. Existing regulations are harmful, so far as does and fawns are concerned, as a considerable number of small animals were killed last season. Previous experience of members of his hunting club had been that the larger proportion of animals taken by them were bucks.

Mr. Sam Harris, Toronto: I know that the Department under the Honourable Mr. Chaffies, and the Special Game Committee, known as the Black Committee, have been giving a great deal of attention to the question of the conservation of game. I listened this morning with a great deal of interest to the different reasons advanced in favour of bringing back the dog. One thing pleased me very much—one of the speakers was 100 per cent. for the conservation of game and the preservation of the outing, which shows that we are not very far apart and that we are all agreed on the main point and that is, that the game should be preserved. Where we differ is as to how this should be accomplished. He referred to his own experience and the pleasure he derived from witnessing wild life in its natural haunts and intimated that the existence of such wild life assisted considerably in attracting tourists to the Province. We must have game and fish intact if we want the visitors. I was interested when they said that it was impossible to enforce buck law. There is no law that can be enforced fully, but laws do control. Such a law would control accidents. Referring to the statement that accidents are more likely to occur where the use of dogs is prohibited, I believe that accidents are rare where fair precaution is taken and believe there were more accidents among rabbit hunters than among those hunting deer. It was his opinion that more care would have to be exercised in the matter of issuing

licenses, to see that the same get into the possession only of responsible persons, and further, that it might be necessary for the Department to restrict and specify areas in which licensed hunters shall do their shooting. Put all the restrictions you like on, but let us have the outing. I am satisfied with the law as it is at present and very much pleased with the report of the Committee. It is a wonderful work that has been done and absolutely a forward movement of the greatest kind, and I am going to ask the boys who like the dogs to give the law a chance. If it does not work out in the interests of conservation, then I will be with them.

Mr. Castle: May I draw your attention to the illustrations on pages 28 and 29 of the Black Committee Report. Was there ever in any man's experience a picture taken like one of these pictures, that could be attributed to dogs? Still hunting drives out small deer, does and fawns. The dog will always get the buck first and, therefore, we get more bucks with dogs than we do without. This has been my experience over twenty-five years of hunting. Hunters will not kill fawns and does when they have a chance to get bucks. A deer can play with a dog any time and you very seldom see a deer in distress. The duty of the dog is to stir up the buck so that you may have a chance to shoot. The wolf is the real menace.

Mr. W. U. Bates, Matagama: Stated he could submit photographs such as those referred to by Mr. Castle, which are just as graphic and showing deer which had been mangled by dogs.

Mr. Moody, Kitchener, expressed his pleasure at the presence of the Minister at the meeting during the morning session. He believes that the Government must have revenue in order to make any progress in the matter of propagation and preservation. He suggested the establishment of an extensive area as a Crown Game Preserve which might be fenced in order that the work of propagation might be undertaken therein, and from which it would be possible to undertake a system of replenishing game. The great trouble has been that only recently there has been more interest in preserving revenue than there has been in propagating and preserving our game. He suggested that after it had been possible to get rid of the wolf, it was found that there was still another destructive force which might be the dog, they would be willing to join hands and discontinue hunting with dogs. I believe that the dog is a benefit and a source of gain to the Department owing to the fact that it will recover deer that would otherwise be lost. Speaking on behalf of my own club, the members would be willing to pay a moderate tax on the dogs in hunting season, but only the hound should be allowed and no other strain, especially the airedale or the police dog. Suggested as a means of additional revenue, a doe and fawn regulation, not a buck law, under which a hunter who shot a fawn would be permitted to bring it out, but who would be penalized to the extent of a license at a fee of \$5.00. Again, the law as it applies to the sale of deer or the carcass, should not apply to our northern settlers, the idea being that the settler would pay \$4.00 for his license. Every man who takes out a license has a perfect right to expect at least the possibility of getting a deer. Some attempt should be made to secure statistics as to the number of deer which are taken, and other information which might be of value. According to information received by him from officials of an express company, of the animals carried by this particular company last season, 75 per cent. were does and fawns, which is a deplorable situation. When you take away dogs, you are disrupting organized camps who have for years supported the Department

in the way of buying a license. The Ontario Hunters' Association have endeavoured to assist the Department, and we will rally around the new Minister and assist him by doing everything we can in the way of making helpful suggestions in the work and propagation and protection of our wild life. I am going to make a prediction, that in the next ten years, unless you put forth a concise programme of propagation and protection, you will have the illicit hunter, the still hunter and the wolf, and you will still have deer, but you won't have as many. I ask you to make a provision that every man be allowed to hunt as he prefers, and let us join hands with the Department in exterminating the wolf. The whole question is that we should work together to increase the revenue of the Department, extinguishing everything that is a menace to our wild life and, if we accomplish that, the whole question is settled.

Mr. Norval Lynn, Secretary, Welland Branch, Ontario Hunter's Association, stated that his association was strongly in favour of the use of dogs for the hunting of deer, and made reference to the resolution that Deputy Game Wardens be allowed to retain their badges of office after the period of appointment had expired and until it was possible to replace the same, and suggested that this was a matter which should receive serious consideration.

Mr. Castle expressed his opinion that in the event that an open season was provided for partridge this year, it should coincide with the full extent of the deer season.

Mr. Russell, Wauhaushene: Suggested the establishment of refuges for deer, and that such areas should be afforded adequate protection. License dogs and use the money thus obtained to provide this protection. Any officer appointed for this purpose, in addition to his work of patrolling, could control existence of the wolf in such areas.

Mr. Hansberry: On behalf of the sportsmen here to-day, I want to thank those responsible and particularly the members of the Committee for their attendance and patient and earnest hearing of the representations which have been submitted.

Mr. Spence, M.P.P., moved a vote of thanks to the Ontario Hunters' Association, other organizations, and individual sportsmen for the manner in which they have presented their arguments, and spoke in appreciation of the splendid way the idea of conservation had been stressed in practically all instances.

Mr. Reid, M.P.P., seconded this motion.

Mr. Castle replied, accepting on behalf of those present the vote of thanks which had been adopted, and Mr. E. L. Hughes also expressed his appreciation of the action of the Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

THIRD MEETING

March 16th, 1933.

The Committee met at 10.00 a.m.

The following members of the Committee were in attendance:—Mr. McLean, Vice-Chairman, and Messrs. Acres, Aubin, Black, Calder, Challies, Colliver, Davis, Graham, Harrison, Henry (East Kent), Hill, Hipel, Hutchinson, Ireland, Kennedy (Temiskaming), Kenning, Lancaster, Loughton, Murray, Newman, Poisson, Robertson, Ross, Sanderson, Sangster, Simpson, Spence, Taylor, Wilson (Lincoln).

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting the representatives of the various Anglers' Associations and Fishing Clubs and stated that before calling upon those who would have representations and recommendations to make, he would ask the Honourable Mr. Challies to address the meeting.

Honourable Mr. Challies: At the outset I want to welcome you all to this meeting of the Special Legislative Committee of the Province dealing with the Department of Game and Fisheries. In view of the time at your disposal, there is no reason why everyone desiring it, should not be heard, and all phases of departmental problems relating to fish life canvassed from all angles. Before proceedings commence, I am making an appeal because of an article which has appeared in one of the Toronto papers, as I feel it is necessary to say that so far as the Department of Game and Fisheries is concerned, the question of politics is divorced from the activities of that Department, and this explanation is made to show just what the Department is up against in some of its activities.

Concerning the question of adverse criticism we get from certain people, who apparently want to play politics, and, for that purpose, the newspapers with their influence, leave the Department in an unfortunate position.

The Minister made reference to the pheasant shoot which was provided last fall, and the precautions which had been taken by the Department in order to assure itself that in the areas which would be involved, the open season for this purpose would be acceptable, and the areas in which the most severe criticism developed were those from which no co-operation or advice had been received from the sportsmen's organizations or members who had been approached for information. Further clippings were produced and, as it had been necessary to institute investigation following the publication of the information therein contained, it was stated for the information of the Committee that in every case the articles did not relate to actual facts, but were attributable to the imagination of the person responsible for the same. He referred to the particular article which had made such an explanation necessary, in which it was noted that the following appeared therein: "Why should Ontario any longer spend tens of thousands of the public's money in stocking with trout the streams of private sportsmen?" I emphatically deny that the Department stocked private streams. We do, however, sell spawn once in awhile, but the fish from our hatcheries are planted in public streams, and public streams only. Supposing we did, as the writer of the article complains, the money does not come from the angler, because the angler, except the non-resident, does not contribute one cent to the exchequer of the Province. This is a deliberate plan to embarrass the Government by an individual,

but he cannot lambaste the Government because of the work it has been carrying out along these lines. I do not think this thing is fair and I say to you in all kindness that if there is to be any criticism, let the same be constructive. As far as politics is concerned, there is none in the Department of Game and Fisheries.

Mr. Carscallen, representing the North Kent Hunting and Fishing Club, was granted permission to address the meeting on game matters. In the representations which are to be made, we have the endorsement and backing of the Kent Angling and Fishing Club, represented by Mr. Colby. We represent anglers and hunters in the marshes of Mitchell's Bay, Lake St. Clair and River St. Clair, and the representations which we shall make have also been made before the Special Game Committee, headed by Mr. Black, and these same submissions you will find in the report of that Committee. I appreciate the kindness shown in allowing me to bring these matters forward. I want to make reference to the wholesale slaughter of wild ducks in the area mentioned, and not only in that area but, according to the report of the Black Committee, at various points along the International Boundary line. The situation is serious and calls for the consideration of the Committee and the Government.

The area to which he had particular reference is marshy; is inaccessible by land, and can only be reached by boat. By speed boat it is within an hour's run of the City of Detroit, and closer than that to the River St. Clair and the St. Clair flats, which are lined on the American side with summer homes and hotels. Most of the area is leased to private hunting clubs, or contained within Indian Reservations. There is only a small strip of marshy land, two or three miles in extent, which is open to the independent shooter. The nearest American shooters' paradise is Anchor Bay, which has become very congested, with the result that they invade that limited public territory of ours, coming over in fast speed boats. In some cases they tow over a houseboat; bring a number of duck hunters and all the necessary equipment and, as far as the law of the Province of Ontario in regard to fish and game is concerned, it is not respected on account of the facilities they have, as these speed boats can easily outrun the equipment of our game officers.

There is no complaint whatever from any conscientious sportsman in that area on the game warden—he is fairminded, a square-shooter—and the men respect the law better on that account.

It was indicated that the American hunter practically monopolizes the duck hunting in this section. Ontario residents cannot go over to their side to shoot ducks under any consideration. According to information supplied by the Michigan Department of Conservation, under their regulations only citizens of the United States are entitled to hunt in Michigan, and a citizen of Canada is not eligible for a Michigan hunting license. Any action which would have in mind a remedy for this situation would in no way injure the tourist end, because these people load up with supplies, ammunition and everything they require before they leave Detroit, and it is recommended by our association that Americans should be prohibited from shooting in this small strip of territory at Mitchell's Bay.

Dr. A. B. James, President of the Ontario Federation of Anglers: First of all I want to thank the Honourable Mr. Challies for attending this meeting, and

his opening remarks have our hearty endorsement. The representations now to be made are from the Federation of Anglers, which organization has continued to grow and prosper notwithstanding the depressed times, and we believe that in our capacity as a federation we have influenced the opinion of anglers to no small degree. I feel sure that the work we have been doing along educational lines has borne considerable fruit. In our activities, we have endeavoured to cover the whole Province and have member clubs as far north and west as Fort William and Nakina, as far east as Ottawa, and are represented by several strong clubs in the southwestern portion of the Province. Our policy, from the first, has been to taboo politics. We have not meddled in politics and do not intend to do so. In seeking legislation, we have at all times kept before us, only the good of the public, and the representations we make to-day are in agreement with the Report of the Special Committee on the Game Fish Situation brought out in 1928-30, and I want to point out that this report is not obsolete but rather is it very much to the fore. The representations which will be submitted are the result of a sifting out of representations submitted to the federation by constituent clubs, and we consider they are workable and feasible, as they are from a conservational and legislative standpoint sound. They are the result not of individual but collective deliberations of anglers, biologists and individuals conversant with the situation in the Province, and there is nothing selfish from an angler's standpoint. There is absolute harmony among the anglers and I believe the points we might bring out will bear more fruit by reason of that harmony.

Although this Committee has not always seen fit to agree with us, we have accepted their deliberations with good grace and in presenting these recommendations this morning, although some of our previous recommendations may have been controversial, we believe a number of them should be repeated and stressed, particularly as we are following out the suggestion contained in the Special Report as referred to, and in discussing the various clauses I hope to have something more to say.

I shall read you the recommendations as passed by the annual convention of the Anglers' Federation. I understand that certain of our member clubs have recommendations to submit and although we, as a federation, have not passed upon them I see no reason why such should not be presented.

The following is a summary of the recommendations of the Ontario Federation of Anglers as presented at this point by Dr. James:

1. That closer supervision by official Game Wardens at West Lake be enforced.
2. That better equipment for water patrol be supplied Game Overseers.
3. That more effort should be put forth in the enforcement of existing fish laws and the protection of streams recently stocked.
4. That the Government and local protective associations should co-operate in the matter of selecting and appointing Deputy Game Wardens.
5. In support of the recommendation of the St. Catharines and Lincoln County Association that all types of nets, except the 36-inch minnow net for

personal bait, be prohibited in the inland waters and the lake and river shores of the County of Lincoln.

6. That Section 3, Subsection 2 (b) of the Fishery Regulations be amended so that the practice referred to would be prohibited in all game fish areas, and that the period now provided be restricted by excluding therefrom the period from April 15th to May 15th.

7. While the Federation is in favour of the principle of a license being placed on fishing rods, yet in view of the present economic conditions, we are not pressing for this regulation at the present time.

8. That the bass season be left as it now stands and that it be not opened any earlier in the inland waters.

9. That Sections 76 and 77 of the Report of the Special Committee on the Game Fish Situation, referring to the protection and propagation of maskinonge, should be adopted and immediate action taken.

10. That investigation of the variation in geographical and climatic and other factors be undertaken with a view to establishing various zones with particular regulations applicable to each zone and its conditions.

11. That matters of reducing the bag limit and increasing the size of speckled trout, and the question of a minimum size for maskinonge should be considered in conjunction with the previous recommendation, and that no changes be made in the meantime.

12. That the setting of night lines and other methods of taking fish not authorized as angling should be definitely prohibited.

13. That the use of seines for the taking of bait minnows should be entirely prohibited, except by officers of the Department for propagatory or stocking work, or under permit of the Department for scientific or educational purposes.

14. That more game fish sanctuaries should be established throughout the Province.

15. That licensed guides should be prohibited from angling while employed in their capacity as such.

16. That consideration should be given to recommendation No. 42 of the Special Game Fish Committee, as follows: "Because of the increasing demands of game fishing and summer resident interest, and the manifest value to local communities of the tourist trade, further reservation of waters for game fishing should be carried out."

17. That consideration should be given to Recommendation No. 81 of the Special Game Fish Committee, as follows: "The commercial fishing line extending along the main or northwest shore with the object of establishing a game fishing area adequate in extent to the importance of summer resident population on the

main shore and islands of affording greater protection to spawning fish in a part of the Great Lakes pre-eminently Canadian, and of restricting inshore net fishing and disposal of fish to operations conducted under Government supervision."

18. That a fish-slide be built in the dam at Dunnville.

19. That the staff of the Department be increased for field and scientific service, or at least that no decrease be made.

20. That the Government give favourable consideration to assisting private clubs in restocking their waters where such waters form part of water systems open for public fishing.

The Honourable Mr. Challies interjected a few remarks on the recommendation concerning the establishment of a rod license, and the Chairman, Mr. McLean, expressed on behalf of the Committee appreciation of the able manner in which Dr. James had presented the recommendations of the federation, and the work which they are undertaking in the interests of the propagation and protection of fish life.

Mr. Moody, Kitchener: Made some reference to the recommendation concerning the establishment of a rod license and expressed surprise at the article which had appeared in a recent issue of "Rod and Gun," and stated that he did not think the first clause, from which it would appear that the Anglers' Federation was opposed to the establishment of a rod license, was officially recognized as being for publication. He stated that he knew many anglers who are, under certain conditions, in favour of a rod license and that it should apply immediately. He suggested that the Committee should give some earnest consideration to this matter, but that the Committee should also, in conjunction, take into consideration the possibility of establishing an age limit; and further, at this time, the matter of a family license to apply to a father and his sons, should be considered.

Mr. J. W. Gravestock, Peterborough: Made some reference to Recommendation No. 6, submitted by the Federation. Some years ago, it had been the practice throughout the Trent Waterway System for persons to dip out coarse fish. It had been found that in this manner, game fish were taken, but that had been rectified by the provisions of the legislation referred to in the recommendation, and he stated that their local association was recommending an extension of this particular section to be effective throughout the Province. Elaborating on the abuses to which this practice is subjected, he suggested that this was a condition which should be considered very carefully before any action was taken. He further suggested that the snagging of fish, as described by him, should be made illegal, as it was responsible for the destruction of fish of all kinds in large quantities. He expressed it as his belief that the Department was willing at all times to co-operate with associations in the matter of seeing that complaints regarding the existence of illegal practices received attention.

Mr. F. J. A. Browne, Kirkland Lake: Made reference to the present regulations governing incorporation of fishways in dams, particularly as it would affect such structures now existing in the Larder Lake area. In view of conditions which he believed were attributable to the existence of the dams in question, which as

yet had not been provided with fishways, he suggested that the matter was one which should receive attention and, in the light of present regulations, to ascertain the necessity, or otherwise, of having fishways incorporated in these particular dams in order that whatever action might be found necessary, following such investigation, might be taken.

The Chairman advised the meeting that the matter of fishways and the control of dams was one governed by federal regulations and that the Provincial Department was endeavouring to secure the co-operation of the Federal authorities in such matters.

Lieutenant-Colonel Wm. C. Michell, M.C., Past President, Toronto Anglers' Association: In his observations, he referred to the work of the Toronto Anglers' Association in educating the boys and girls of the Province as to the necessity for conservation, and acknowledged the splendid support received from members of the Committee, and the Minister, in connection with his work.

This year there had been conducted an Essay Competition on the Conservation of Game Fish, and the assistance provided by Dr. Harcourt and Mr. Harrison, so far as the Parry Sound and Nipissing Districts had been concerned, had been invaluable. Over two hundred essays had been received and the quality of these papers had been better than anything which had been written in previous years. They contained very much information as to what is done in the way of destruction to fish. Extracts from the essays received indicate the existence of such practices as the operation of night lines, netting, and, in many cases, opposition was voiced to the taking of speckled trout seven inches in length, and black bass ten inches in length, as is now permitted, and that these particular minimum lengths should be raised to nine and twelve inches, respectively. The finest way to teach conservation is through the young people and it is anticipated that with the co-operation of the Honourable Mr. Chaffies, the Department of Education, and a small committee of the Toronto Anglers' Association, it will be possible to provide reading lessons on the conservation of game and fish and forests, and it should be a splendid thing to get these in our text-books.

Mr. Jos. Sheedy, Past President of the Ontario Federation of Anglers: Stated that he was fairly well in accord with everything Dr. James had said. He thought there were one or two things which would be contentious, especially the suggestion regarding the establishment of a rod license. It was his opinion that the taking of fish by rod and line was a method adopted by the poor people in many sections during the months that angling was possible, to provide themselves with some of their food supplies, and he was not sure that it would be wise to suggest to the Committee that such a situation should be aggravated. The establishment of a rod license just now would appear to me to be something of a hardship.

Two years ago I was responsible for bringing the thought forward of giving assistance to private clubs in stocking their waters, where such waters formed part of a system in some of the waters of which the general public were permitted to fish. In view of the fact that it was his idea that the member of a private club was essentially the highest type of conservationist, he was entirely in sympathy with the suggestion that in the event that private clubs found it impossible to get the fry they wanted in the open market, the Government should be prepared

to step in and render some assistance, and it was his belief that this practice was in effect at the present time. He further stated that considerable time and thought had been given to the suggestions which had been presented by the Federation of Anglers, and that these representations represented the product of the best thought on conservation throughout the Province.

Mr. E. L. Hughes, Ontario Tourist Trade Association: Expressed his thanks to the Minister and the members of the Committee for the attention they are giving to the meetings. He had no complaint to make concerning any recommendations which had been put forward by the Federation, as in his opinion they were all good and along constructive lines. While the organization which I represent is one which consists of commercial outfitters, it is one of the best bodies you have on conservation in the Province of Ontario. We are responsible, in a large measure, for inducing non-residents to visit the Province and, therefore, in bringing in some of the revenue received by the Department of Game and Fisheries. The outfitters would be in favour of the establishment of an angling license in the Province, and he stated that in his opinion that as there would be objection to the action when it was put through, every consideration should be given to the proposition at this time. Such a license should, undoubtedly, be responsible for a considerable increase in the revenue of the Department, and these funds should go to the Department of Game and Fisheries for restocking purposes.

In view of the fact that the Department never was in a better position than it is at present to undertake the stocking of speckled trout, he was opposed to a suggestion which had been put forward, that the open season on this species should terminate on September 1st. In Northern Ontario this open season should be from May 1st to September 14th, as at present.

Mr. McKay, Departmental Biologist: Made some remarks concerning the spawning period for speckled trout in Northern Ontario. It is found that the speckled trout commences to gather in the streams during the latter part of September, before the actual spawning occurs. It is possible that in many of the streams in the North the trout will assemble in such large numbers in the early part of September that it would be quite easy to do away with them. It is felt that the present season is sufficiently adequate for the North.

Mr. Carscallen, North Kent Hunting and Fishing Club: Spoke in approval of the suggestion which had been made for the zoning of the Province in connection with the establishment of the various close seasons, and particularly as such action would have reference to the black bass season in the waters of their section.

Mr. Colby, Kent Angling and Hunting Association: Spoke in favour of extending the open season on black bass in their waters so that this season would terminate November 1st.

In view of the entire absence of speckled trout in their section, they are dependent for their game fishing upon the black bass, chiefly the large-mouthed black bass, they are found only out in Lake St. Clair, and very few have the necessary equipment to avail themselves of the fishing this species provides. However, the extension of the season suggested by him would assist guides to secure some additional revenue, which they require in these times. He did not

think that any such action would be detrimental from the spawning or conservation point of view.

He was of the opinion that the Committee should move slowly in connection with the establishment of a rod license, but, in the event that consideration was to be given to this matter, he suggested further that at the same time consideration should be given to the exemption of minors from the operation of such a regulation, and that a family license should also be arranged.

Mr. Griger, Aldershot: Advanced his opinion, and the opinion of his association, that the use of dip nets in their local waters should be prohibited entirely. The use of these nets had been responsible in the past for a large depletion in the supply of fish available for the angler in these waters. The only recognized game fish they had was the large-mouthed black bass, and there were too few of these. Pike is the dominant species and he is now considered as a semi-game fish. Many anglers of the Province do not endorse this view, but they are possibly more fortunately situated than we are. He was of the opinion that game fish did not discriminate when it came to the question of taking food. This practice of dip netting is permitted during the months of April and May, the period of spawning, which must be detrimental to our fish life.

Mr. F. J. A. Browne, Kirkland Lake: Assured the Minister that their association was willing to co-operate in every way possible with the Department. Their association, practically to a man, was in favour of the establishment of a rod license. He referred to their local situation, where more than 50 per cent. of the population was foreigners, a large proportion of whom were Finlanders. They are the most ruthless type of poacher and their operations have caused serious depletion of the local waters, and practically most of the game as well. They are asking for a change in the lake trout season, which is the result of personal observations and they think that their representations are justified and that the close season, especially in the northern waters, should commence considerably earlier than it does at the present time. He also made reference to the position of their association as being opposed to the issuing of gill net licenses in their inland waters, as the operation of such nets in past years had been responsible for a great depletion of the supply of fish. It was further stated that none of those who act in the capacity of guides in that section are in possession of Guides' Licenses, and that this was a matter which should receive some consideration.

Mr. Gravestock, Peterborough: Stated that it was his opinion, and the opinion of his association, that no further restriction should be made applicable to the open season for pickerel in their waters, and that it would not be wise to extend the season for black bass or maskinonge.

Dr. A. B. James: Stated that he thought some misunderstanding had arisen in connection with the suggestion put forward by the federation for an amendment to Subsection 2 (b) of Section 3 of The Dominion Special Fishery Regulations. Their suggestion was that these provisions should be made applicable to the whole Province in so far as game fish waters are involved and, further, that the season during which the taking of coarse fish by dip net and spear is permitted, be curtailed. As there had been no action on the recommendation of the Special Game Fish Committee that the use, possession and sale of spears be prohibited, he stated that they were seeking by the present suggestion to enter a wedge into

the situation by shortening the season and if any benefit is derived from a conservational standpoint, and the powers that be can see that this method will be responsible for conserving fish, they will perhaps be willing to give us total abolition of these two methods of taking fish.

We have made no recommendation regarding the closing of the speckled trout season on the 1st of September. Last year we did make the recommendation and we have asked that the season be left as it is.

Mr. Gregg: Reported that all coarse fish, such as ling, sucker, and pike had been responsible for the destruction of their speckled trout fishing. He was in favour of the use of the dip net for the taking of these coarse fish, as now provided, and would go further by having the Department supervise the operations for the removal of such coarse fish. He made some reference to a species of white fish which inhabited certain waters in the vicinity of the Black Donald, and which grew to a size of fourteen or fifteen pounds. It is not possible to take these fish by means of hook and line but only by net, and he suggested that some one with authority might take a few of these fish for submission to the Department for examination.

Mr. Hart: Made reference to the importance of the work which is being undertaken by the Department, especially in the propagation of fish; field work, and biological work, and that these activities should not be reduced, and if funds were necessary to carry out this suggestion, especially as it would apply to work concerning game fish, he declared himself in favour of the establishment of a rod license, and submitted the following recommendations:

1. That he was in favour of adding to the revenue of the Department by the establishment of a rod license; and
2. There should be no reduction in the excellent work which was being done by the Department.

Mr. Moody of Kitchener: Had been pleased to listen to the representations submitted, and recommendations which had been made and, particularly those which had favoured the establishment of a rod license. He pleaded for co-operation as between hunters and anglers and that they should first consolidate their forces and work with the Department. He further suggested that the Game Laws and Fishery Regulations should be printed and issued as separate pamphlets.

Mr. Newman, M.P.P.: Expressed his delight at the thoughtfulness of the Committee to have had the representatives of the anglers' organizations present at the meeting and make their representations. He realized that they were all good sports, as evidenced by the many occasions on which they had given advice, and the charitableness with which they had dealt with us. He apologized for his temporary absence during the meeting of the Committee—that the same had been caused owing to membership on another legislative committee, a meeting of which at the same time it had been necessary for him to attend.

In appreciation of their attendance, he moved a vote of thanks to the

representatives of the Anglers' Association who had been present. This motion was seconded by Dr. Simpson, M.P.P., and carried.

The meeting adjourned, the Committee to reassemble at the call of the Chair, on motion of Mr. Newman.

FOURTH MEETING

March 21st, 1933.

The Committee met at 10.00 a.m.

The following members of the Committee were in attendance:—Mr. McLean, Vice-Chairman, and Messrs. Aubin, Bell, Challies, Colliver, Davis, Elliott (Rainy River), Graham, Hambly, Harcourt, Harrison, Henry (East Kent), Hipel, Hutchinson, Kennedy (Temiskaming), Lancaster, Laughton, Murphy (Beaches), Newman, Oliver, Raven, Reid, Robertson, Ross, Sanderson, Sangster, Skinner, Spence, Staples, Taylor, Willson (Niagara Falls), Wilson (Lincoln).

Approval was given to suggestion that the definition of "non-resident" at present provided by the Dominion Special Fishery Regulations for the Province of Ontario should be amended to read: "Non-resident" shall mean any person who has not actually resided in the Province of Ontario for a period of twelve consecutive months immediately preceding the time that his residence becomes material under the provisions of this Act."

Recommendation from the Peterborough Fish and Game Protective Association that the method of angling described by them as "snagging" should be prohibited in game fish waters was approved.

In view of the willingness of the Quebec Department of Game and Fisheries to co-operate to the extent of providing similar action concerning the waters of the Ottawa River under their jurisdiction, the recommendation to the effect that the open season on black bass and muskionge, in the waters of the Ottawa River, should commence July 1st to terminate October 15th was approved.

It was recommended that the Department should arrange to investigate conditions as they affected black bass in the waters of the Pelee Island section, and in the Counties of Essex and Kent.

The recommendation for a close season on certain species of frogs, as specified, was carried.

The recommendation that Guides' Licenses be issued only to resident British subjects was carried.

Departmental recommendations—three in number—concerning lake trout, open season and limit of catch, were approved.

It was recommended that domestic licenses covering nets for use in inland waters be issued only to resident British subjects or *bona fide* settlers in the discretion of the Department.

The following recommendation concerning an open season on pickerel was carried—Subsection 2 of Section 8, Dominion Special Fishery Regulations:—

“In the other waters of the Province other than those specified in Clause (1) of this section, to the south but not including Lake Nipissing and the French and Mattawa Rivers, no one shall fish for, catch or kill any yellow pickerel (pike-perch or doré) or pike from the 1st day of April to the 15th day of May in each year, both days inclusive, and in the other waters of the Province other than those specified in Clause (1) of this section, to the north and west of, and including Lake Nipissing and the French and Mattawa Rivers, no one shall fish for, catch or kill any yellow pickerel (pike-perch or doré) or pike from the 15th day of April to the 15th day of May in each year.”

Certain recommendations regarding reservation of waters as follows:—

(1) By the Ontario Federation of Anglers in respect of certain Georgian Bay waters; (2) Cornwall Game and Fish Protective Association in respect of the River Aux-Raisins (Black River) and Ross Creek; (3) Rainy River District organizations, as to the waters of Whitefish Bay, Lake-of-the-Woods, were left to the discretion of the Department with the provision that so far as the third recommendation was concerned, in the event that action was to be taken, no hardship would be imposed upon any who might be interested.

It was recommended that in the list of waters excepted from the operation of Section 2 (b) of Section 3 of the Dominion Special Fishery Regulations, the following additional waters should be included, namely: Crow Lake, Crow River and Beaver Creek, in the Counties of Peterborough and Hastings.

The recommendation of the Longue Sault Fish and Game Association in respect of permitting the gaffing and spearing of sturgeon in the Longue Sault Rapids was left to the discretion of the Department, as was the recommendation of the Smith's Falls Fish and Game Protective Association in favour of granting domestic licenses for the taking of whitefish in Rideau Lake during the month of November.

It was recommended that suggestion received from Mr. J. W. Gravestock, Peterborough Fish and Game Protective Association, that the provisions of Subsection 5, of Section 13, of the Dominion Special Fishery Regulations should not apply to waters inhabited solely by speckled trout be approved.

The meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.

FIFTH MEETING

March 24th, 1933.

The Committee met at 10.00 a.m.

The following members of the Committee were in attendance:—Mr. McLean, Vice-Chairman, and Messrs. Acres, Aubin, Bell, Burt, Challies, Colliver, Davis, Graham, Graves, Harrison, Hill, Ireland, Lancaster, McMillen, Murray, Newman, Reid, Sanderson, Sangster, Simpson, Spence, Taylor, Vaughan, Wilson (Lincoln).

Mr. Clarkson addressed the meeting on behalf of the St. Anne's Club and the following is a summary of his statement:—

The Club had been established for a period of fifty years and it covered lands leased from the Department of Indian Affairs and, in the time during which the lease had been operative, they had expended some forty or fifty thousand dollars on improvements. Previous to the establishment of existing government regulations, as they had applied, they had adopted their own regulations such as restricting the area in which shooting could be undertaken and the number of birds which it would be possible for members to take, and had thus been responsible for preservation of the supply of birds.

Quite naturally, the food supply in that area has been diminished and reference was made to the method which they had adopted to augment this available food supply. Apparently conditions as they exist, according to Mr. Clarkson, are such that it is necessary, in order to retain the birds during the period of the hunting season, to undertake artificial feeding, though members of their club never shoot at the actual time when such feeding is undertaken.

He stated that it was his opinion that the St. Anne's Club was the most important sanctuary and that their work and operations were responsible for the duck shooting which now exists on the lands of the club, and the lands and marshes surrounding the same, and, should artificial feeding be prohibited, it would, undoubtedly, put their club out of business.

The following suggestions were submitted by Mr. Clarkson for the consideration of the Committee:—

- (1) Prohibit the construction of hides of material other than natural rushes.
- (2) Restrict feeding.
- (3) Prevent shooting at hides until twelve hours had elapsed after artificial feeding.

The Chairman presented a letter along these lines, which had been received by him from Mr. Osler.

At this point there was considerable discussion amongst the Committee concerning the practice of baiting and artificial feeding of ducks, and it was

decided to allow the matter to stand for further investigation and report by the Department.

The recommendation of the Special Game Committee as to the creation of 18 Mile Island as a Crown Game Preserve was referred to the Department, to be taken up with Mr. Aubin, M.P.P., and the recommendation regarding the creation of a Crown Game Preserve in the Hannah Bay section was also left with the Department.

The recommendation of the Department for a close season on elk was approved.

The recommendation of the Special Game Committee concerning guides was approved.

The Committee recommended the establishment of a Province-wide gun license, and suggested for the consideration of the proper authorities that the fee in this connection should be fixed at \$1.00, and further, that the issue of such licenses should be restricted to resident British subjects.

It was recommended that no protection should be provided for birds of prey, and further, that the starling among the species of birds definitely specified in Section 8, Subsection 1, the destruction of which is not prohibited, be included.

The recommendation of the Special Game Committee concerning Indians was left with the Department.

The following recommendations were made in respect of licensed fur dealers:—

(1) Resident dealers in possession of what are known as "Store" licenses should not be restricted to a specified territory.

(2) Every travelling fur buyer shall be called upon to furnish a bond of five times the amount of his license fee.

It was recommended that the use of dogs for the taking of mink, beaver and otter should be prohibited.

It was recommended that mourning doves should be afforded complete protection under Section 7 (*d*).

An open season for otter, as suggested by the Special Game Committee, with the possible elimination of the District of Algoma, was approved.

The recommendations of the Special Game Committee that future seasons for partridge and pheasants should be left to the discretion of the Department were approved, and it was further recommended that heavier penalties should be provided following the conviction of an offender for the illegal killing of pheasants.

The Committee recommended that the administration of Game and Fish

resources within Algonquin Park, Rondeau Park, and Quetico Park should be placed within the jurisdiction of the Department of Game and Fisheries.

Recommendations as to raccoon:—

(1) Restocking, (2) Close season, were left to the discretion of the Department.

The recommendation of the Special Game Committee to the effect that all traps, deadfalls or snares should be lifted or destroyed at the end of the trapping season was approved.

The recommendation as to an open season for black and grey squirrel was left with the Department.

Recommendation of the Blind River Protective Association that trapping licenses be issued only to resident British subjects was approved.

Recommendations in favour of the establishment of a system of restricted trapping lines, as supported by the recommendation of the Special Game Committee, were left with the Department.

The recommendation of the Special Game Committee that the placing of traps previous to the commencement of the open season should be prohibited was approved.

The Committee recommended that the amount of wolf bounty, as provided by existing regulations, be left as it is, and that the Department should take up with adjacent Provinces of Quebec and Manitoba the question of payment of uniform bounties in the three provinces on a scale not lower than the bounties now provided in Ontario.

Consideration was given to the following recommendation of the Special Game Committee:—

"Permits to raise wild ducks, quail and English ring-necked pheasants in captivity for breeding purposes only is recommended; birds raised in captivity should carry a metallic band, obtainable only from the Department, attached above one knee."

The same was approved, and the question of the sale of such birds was referred to the Department for consideration.

It was recommended that Section 59, Subsection 2, should be amended so that it would be possible for officers of the Department, without having to be in possession of search warrants, to search the premises of hunting, mining, lumber and construction camps.

Approval was granted to the departmental request for amendment to Section 54, which, in special circumstances, would permit shipments as enumerated therein to be made by freight.

The meeting adjourned at 12.50 p.m.

SIXTH MEETING

March 29th, 1933.

The Committee met at 10.00 a.m.

The following members of the Committee were in attendance:—Mr. McLean, Vice-Chairman, and Messrs. Acres, Bell, Black, Calder, Challies, Davis, Elliott (Rainy River), Hambly, Harcourt, Harrison, Hipel, Hill, Hutchinson, Kennedy (Temiskaming), Lancaster, Colliver, Laughton, McLean, McMillen, McNaughton, Murray, Newman, Oliver, Reid, Robertson, Sanderson, Sangster, Spence, Taylor, Vaughan, Willson (Niagara Falls), Wilson (Lincoln).

Following a discussion it was recommended that provision should be made to define what shall be considered as a "monitor" as referred to in existing Section 34.

The following recommendation of the Special Game Committee, 1931-1933, was approved:—

"That advertisements be inserted once each year in every newspaper of the Province, calling public attention to the conservation of wild life.

"That the Department of Education enforce the study in the public and separate schools of wild life conservation, and that the courses in nature study deal with this aspect of the problem.

"The part that boys especially play in the guardianship of wild life is particularly important and requires emphasis."

Mr. Elliott, M.P.P., Rainy River, presented a resolution of the Board of Trade of his section which was to the effect that all inland lakes in the Rainy River and Kenora Districts be closed to commercial fishing, particularly the Upper and Lower Manitou Lakes, which resolution was referred to the Department for consideration.

The representations of the County Councils of the Counties of Simcoe, Dufferin and Grey, respecting an open season on deer in their respective counties were left with the Department.

The resolutions of the County Councils of the Counties of Northumberland and Prince Edward requesting a close season on deer in their respective counties were left with the Department.

The Committee approved the recommendation of the Special Game Committee for the following changes in the open season for the taking of deer and moose:—

"Division A, Section 7, Subsection (a), October 1 to November 25, inclusive.

"Division B, Section 7, Subsection (b), October 25 to November 25, inclusive.

"Division E, Section 7, Subsection (cc), November 10 to November 25, inclusive."

The following recommendation of the Special Game Committee was approved:—

"Coupons attached to deer and moose hunter's license shall be completed and returned to the Department with report of take, and weight of take. Coupon shall set forth penalty for failure to make return, and time limit allowed."

The recommendation of the Special Game Committee that appropriate penalty should be provided in cases where concealment of carcasses of deer and moose was proved during transportation in a motor vehicle or conveyance of any kind, was approved contingent upon the right of search.

Recommendation from the Department suggesting amendments to Section 13 governing the hunting of deer, and Section 33 which would govern the donation of deer or moose, were approved.

The following recommendation of the Special Game Committee, namely, "that it is desirable to prohibit field training of bird dogs in the months of May, June, July and August," was approved. At this point there was considerable discussion among the members of the Committee regarding provisions of The Game and Fisheries Act which prohibited the use of dogs for the hunting of deer following which Dr. Harcourt moved that the existing regulations remain as they are, which motion was carried.

Mr. Taylor moved for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the killing of does and fawns in this Province, which motion was carried.

The following recommendation of the Special Game Committee, namely, "under no circumstances should deer or moose be shot or pursued in the water by means of any conveyance," was approved.

The meeting adjourned at 3.00 p.m.

INDEX

TO APPENDIX No. 1

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

SESSION OF 1933

	PAGE
BARBER, FRANK, AND ASSOCIATES LTD.—	
Resolution <i>re</i> production of vouchers, etc.	7
BETZNER, OLIVER, Waterloo Township borrow pit—	
Resolution <i>re</i> production of vouchers, etc.	8
BLACK, HON. W. D.—	
Elected as Chairman of the Committee.	7
Breslau Bridge—	
MR. HIPEL's resolution <i>re</i> production by respective parties, of all vouchers, cheques, etc.	7
MR. R. M. SMITH, Deputy Minister of Highways, examined by MR. HIPEL.	10
HON. MR. HENRY signed contract for.	24
MR. R. M. SMITH examined by HON. MR. MACAULAY.	46
Appendix "A" showing tenders submitted and estimated cost of materials.	66
Appendix "B," report of bridge engineer to Deputy Minister.	67
CANADIAN INSPECTION AND TESTING CO., LTD.—	
Resolution <i>re</i> production of vouchers, etc.	8
DUFFERIN PAVING AND CONSTRUCTION CO.—	
Resolution <i>re</i> production of vouchers, etc.	8
FINLAYSON, HON. W.—	
Moves resolution <i>re</i> election of HON. W. D. BLACK as Chairman of Committee.	7
MR. GEORGE HOGARTH, Deputy Minister of Public Works Department, examined by	55
MR. HUGH RICKARD of B. M. & T. Jenkins examined by.	63
HIPEL, MR.—	
Moved resolution <i>re</i> production of vouchers, cheques, receipts, etc.	7
Examined MR. R. M. SMITH, Deputy Minister of Highways.	10
HOGARTH, Mr. G.—	
MR. NIXON moves resolution <i>re</i> appearance of, before Committee.	9
Examined by MR. NIXON.	49
Examined by HON. MR. FINLAYSON.	55

JACQUES AND HAY—

Makers of furniture purchased from B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd.....	62
Jenkins, B. M. & T., Ltd.—	
MR. GEORGE HOGARTH examined by MR. NIXON <i>re</i> purchase of furniture from.....	49
MR. GEORGE HOGARTH examined by HON. MR. FINLAYSON <i>re</i> purchase of furniture from.....	55
MR. HUGH P. RICKARD, General Manager of, examined by MR. NIXON.....	59
MR. HUGH P. RICKARD, examined by HON. MR. FINLAYSON.....	63

MACAULAY, HON. MR.—

MR. R. M. SMITH examined by, <i>re</i> Breslau Bridge.....	46
Maintenance Bonds—	
Discussed.....	25, 37
Meetings—	
1. April 5th at 10.30 a.m.....	7
2. April 7th at 9.30 a.m.....	10

NIXON, MR.—

Moves resolution <i>re</i> appearance of MR. GEORGE HOGARTH and MR. HUGH P. RICKARD of B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd., before Committee.....	9
MR. GEORGE HOGARTH, Deputy Minister of Public Works Department, examined by	49
MR. HUGH P. RICKARD, General Manager, B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd., examined by..	59

RICKARD, MR. HUGH P., of B. M. & T. Jenkins, Ltd.—

MR. NIXON moves resolution <i>re</i> appearance of, before Committee.....	9
Examined by MR. NIXON.....	59
Examined by HON. MR. FINLAYSON.....	63

STANDARD PAVING, LTD.—

Resolution <i>re</i> production of vouchers, etc.....	8
SMITH, MR. R. M., Deputy Minister of Highways—	
Examined by MR. HIPEL <i>re</i> Breslau Bridge.....	10
Examined by HON. MR. MACAULAY.....	46

WATERLOO TOWNSHIP BORROW PIT—

Resolution <i>re</i> production of vouchers, etc.....	8
---	---

INDEX

TO APPENDIX No. 2

PROCEEDINGS OF A SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TO CONSIDER A MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

SESSION OF 1933

BALDWIN, MR. (Court Stenographer)—	PAGE
Examined by MR. MURPHY.....	89
Reads manuscript of evidence <i>re</i> argument between MR. HAMILTON CASSELS and MR. WALDRON.....	90
Examined by MR. MURPHY.....	96
Report of Board of Optometry Inquiry given to newspapers by.....	97
BINNS, EDWARD, Optometrist—	
Examined by the Chairman.....	145
Cross-examined by MR. MURPHY.....	145, 147
MR. MURPHY quotes from letter written to optometrists by.....	148
“Bourinot,” quoted by MR. WALDRON.....	103
BROWN, HAROLD C., Sales Manager and Office Manager of Ritholtz Optical Co., Ltd.—	
Examined by MR. MURPHY.....	153
Cross-examined by MR. WALDRON.....	155
CASSELS, MR. HAMILTON—	
Argument between MR. WALDRON and, before Optometry Board read by Court Reporter, MR. BALDWIN.....	90
Examined by MR. MURPHY.....	131
Cross-examined by MR. WALDRON.....	132
Letter from, to MR. E. J. MURPHY, produced and marked Exhibit “4”.....	142
EXHIBITS—	
1. Copy of Toronto “Daily Star,” Friday, March 10th, 1933.....	89
2. Copy of evidence taken by MR. BALDWIN, Stenographic Reporter for Board of Optometry.....	97
3. MR. WALDRON’S statement.....	107
4. Letter from MR. HAMILTON CASSELS to MR. E. J. MURPHY.....	142
5. Letter written by EDWARD BINNS to Optometrists.....	148
6. Copy of “Mail and Empire,” dated March 15th, 1933.....	162
GIBBS, ERIC, Reporter for “Daily Star”—	
Examined.....	98

HENRY, HON. MR.—

PAGE

Motion by, *re* appointment of a Select Committee..... 77

HILL, J. F. (Hastings East)—

Appointed as member of Select Committee..... 78

HUMPHRIES, MR. I. A., K.C.—

Examined by MR. MURPHY..... 150

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT—

GORDON WALDRON statement charges contravention of Section 49..... 77

Statement and charge contravention of Section 54..... 78

LEWIS, ALEX. C. (Clerk, Legislative Assembly)—

Presents copy of "Daily Star" of March 10th, 1933..... 89

MATTHEWS, WILLIAM—

Examined by MR. MURPHY..... 126

"May" quoted by MR. WALDRON..... 104

Meetings—

1. Friday, March 24th at 10.30 a.m..... 81

2. Tuesday, March 28th at 10.30 a.m..... 86

MURPHY, MR. (St. Patrick)—

Motion by, *re* appointment of Committee (withdrawn)..... 77

Examined MR. BALDWIN, Court Reporter..... 89

Cross-examined MR. GORDON WALDRON..... 109

Examined MR. W. J. SUMMERS..... 124

Examined MR. WILLIAM MATTHEWS..... 126

Examined MR. GIUSEPPI SAFERITO..... 127

Examined MR. JAMES C. THOMPSON..... 129

Examined MR. IVAN S. NOTT..... 130

Examined HAMILTON CASSELS, K.C..... 131

Examined EDWARD S. BINNS..... 145, 147

Examined MR. I. A. HUMPHRIES, K.C..... 150

Examined MR. HAL C. BROWN..... 153

McCREA, HON. MR. (Sudbury)—

Appointed Chairman of Select Committee..... 78

Outlines position of Select Committee of the House to MR. WALDRON..... 102

NOTT, IVAN S., Optometrist—

Examined..... 130

O'CONNELL, DANIEL—

Case of, cited by MR. WALDRON..... 104

O'CONNOR VS. WALDRON—

Case of, cited by MR. WALDRON..... 104

OPTOMETRY, BOARD OF—

MR. BALDWIN (Court Stenographer) took evidence at..... 89

	PAGE
Order of the House appointing a Select Committee to Consider a Matter of Privilege—	
Motion by MR. MURPHY (St. Patrick) <i>re</i> appointment of a Committee (withdrawn).	77
Motion by MR. HENRY (York East) <i>re</i> appointment of a Select Committee.....	77, 86

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to consider a Matter of Privilege...	79
---	----

RICHARDSON, C. E. (Perth South)—	
Appointed as member of Select Committee.....	78

SAPERITO, GUISEPPI—

Examined by MR. MURPHY.....	127
-----------------------------	-----

SMITH, MR. (Essex)—	
Appointed as member of Select Committee.....	78

SUMMERS, MR. W. J.—	
Examined by Mr. Murphy.....	124

TAYLOR, D. J. (Grey North)—

Appointed as member of Select Committee.....	78
--	----

THOMPSON, JAMES C., Secretary of the Board of Examiners in Optometry—	
Examined.....	129

Toronto "Daily Star"—

Statement reported to have been made by MR. GORDON WALDRON, K.C., contained in	77, 79, 86
MAJOR LEWIS presents copy of "The Star" of Friday, March 10th, 1933.....	89
ERIC GIBBS, Reporter, examined.....	98

TWEED, MR. S. C. (Waterloo North)—

Appointed as member of Select Committee.....	78
Motion by, to subpoena MR. WALDRON.....	82

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, No. 25—

Contain reference to statement in "Star".....	89
---	----

WALDRON, GORDON, K.C.—

Statement contained in Toronto "Daily Star" reputed to have been made by.....	77
Motion to subpoena, moved by MR. TWEED.....	82
Discusses procedure.....	87
Formal proof of statement required.....	89
Argument with MR. HAMILTON CASSELS before Board of Optometry read by Court Reporter, MR. BALDWIN.....	90
Submits list of names of his witnesses to the Chairman.....	100
Examined.....	101
Chairman outlines position of Select Committee.....	102
Quotes "Bourinot".....	103
Cites case of MR. URE, a Reporter reprimanded by the Speaker in 1850.....	104
Cites case of MR. J. A. MACDONALD who in 1879 insulted MR. HUNTINGDON.....	104
Quotes "May".....	104
Cites speech of DANIEL O'CONNELL (1838).....	104

WALDRON, GORDON, K.C.—*Continued*

	PAGE
Cites case of O'CONNOR vs. WALDRON.....	105
Statement by, filed as Exhibit "3".....	107
MR. MURPHY cross-examines.....	107
Cross-examined MR. HAMILTON CASSELS, K.C.....	132
Cross-examined MR. HAROLD C. BROWN.....	155

WILSON, F. W. (Windsor East)—

Appointed as member of Select Committee.....	78
Seconds motion to subpoena MR. WALDRON.....	82

INDEX

TO APPENDIX No. 3

MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FISH AND GAME

SESSION OF 1933

ALGONQUIN PARK—

	PAGE
MR. CASTLE <i>re</i> placing under jurisdiction of Game and Fisheries Department for purposes of game and fish protection.....	170
Recommendation <i>re</i> game and fish resources.....	192

American Duck Hunters—

MR. CARSCALLEN <i>re</i> disrespect of, for game laws and monopoly by, of Ontario duck-shooting grounds.....	180
--	-----

Anglers' Associations and Fishing Clubs—

Welcomed by Vice-Chairman of Fish and Game Committee.....	179
---	-----

BATES, MR. W. U., Metagama—

On use of dogs in hunting deer.....	177
-------------------------------------	-----

BELL, MR. (Bellwoods)—

<i>Re</i> hearing representatives of Associations after presentation of Special Game Committee's Report.....	168
--	-----

BENNETT, Mr., Walkerville—

Favours use of dogs in hunting deer.....	175
--	-----

Biological Branch, Department of Game and Fisheries—

MR. MCKAY, Department Biologist, addresses Committee.....	185
MR. HART on work being performed by.....	187

Birds of Prey—

No protection provided for.....	191
---------------------------------	-----

Black Bass—

MR. COLBY, Kent Angling and Hunting Association, <i>re</i> extending open season for...	185
MR. GRAVESTOCK, Peterborough, opposes extension of open season.....	186
Recommendation submitted <i>re</i> Ottawa River.....	188
Conditions in Pelee Island Section and Counties of Essex and Kent to be investigated <i>re</i>	188

British Subjects—

Recommendation <i>re</i> issuance of Guides' Licenses to.....	188
Recommendation <i>re</i> issuance of license for domestic nets for use in inland waters....	189
Recommendation <i>re</i> issuance of gun licenses to.....	191
Recommendation <i>re</i> issuance of trapping licenses to.....	192

BROWNE, MR. F. J. A., Kirkland Lake—

<i>Re</i> Fishing Regulations.....	183
<i>Re</i> Rod License.....	186

Buck Law—	PAGE
MR. JAMES WILSON would establish.....	176
Burwash—	
Elk to be established at.....	166
CALDER, MR. (Kent West)—	
Re feeding and baiting ducks.....	171
Camps, Hunting, Mining, Lumber and Construction—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> searching without warrant.....	192
CARSCALLEN, MR., North Kent Hunt and Fishing Club—	
Re Wild Ducks, slaughter of.....	180
Re American hunter and disrespect of law.....	180
Re Zoning in close seasons.....	185
CASTLE, MR., President, Ontario Hunters' Game Protective Association—	
Re Protection of game, fish and birds.....	169
Re placing Algonquin Park under jurisdiction of Game and Fisheries Department for purpose of game and fish protection.....	170
Supports resolution <i>re</i> hunting water-fowl.....	171
Favours use of dogs in hunting deer.....	175, 177
Re open season for partridge.....	178
Accepts vote of thanks on behalf of Hunters' Associations.....	178
CHAILLES, HON. MR.—	
Welcomes Members of Committee.....	166
Activities of Department discussed.....	166
Re establishment of elk at Petewawa.....	166
Re report of Special Game Committee.....	166, 168, 169
Elk to be established at Burwash.....	166, 173
Re open season for pheasants.....	167
Re Trout Rearing Station at Dorion.....	167
Re Fishing Licenses for Nipigon waters.....	167
Re Trespassing on farmers' lands.....	172
Welcomes Anglers' Associations.....	179
Re Newspaper criticism of Department.....	179
CLARKSON, MR., St. Anne's Club—	
Presents recommendations <i>re</i> duck shooting.....	190
COLBY, MR. W. D., Kent Angling and Hunting Association—	
On practice of feeding and baiting ducks.....	171
Favours use of dogs in hunting deer.....	175
Re extending open season for black bass.....	185
Re Rod license.....	186
Commercial Fishing—	
Resolution presented by MR. ELLIOTT (Rainy River) <i>re</i> closing certain lakes to.....	193
Committee, Fish and Game—	
Sportsmen express thanks to Committee on Fish and Game for attendance, etc.....	178
Conservation of Wild Life—	
MR. ROBINSON, Middlesex Hunters' Game Protective Association, <i>re</i>	169
MR. SAM HARRIS, Toronto, <i>re</i>	176
LIEUTENANT-COLONEL WILLIAM MICHELL, Past President, Toronto Anglers' Association, <i>re</i>	184
MR. JOS. SHEEDY, Past President, Ontario Federation of Anglers, <i>re</i>	184
Recommendations respecting.....	193

Cornwall Game and Fish Protective Association—	PAGE
Recommendation <i>re</i> Black River and Ross Creek.....	189
Coupons Attached to Deer and Moose Licenses showing Certain Particulars—	
Recommendation of Special Game Committee <i>re</i> , approved.....	194
Crown Game Preserve—	
Creation of 18 Mile Island recommended as.....	191
DAVIES, MR. ELMER, Kingston—	
Supports recommendation <i>re</i> use of dogs in hunting deer.....	173
<i>Re</i> causes of destruction of deer.....	173
Deer, Concealment of Carcasses of—	
Recommendation respecting penalty for.....	194
Deer, Destruction of—	
MR. ELMER DAVIES, Kingston, discusses causes.....	173
Deer Hunting—	
Amendments to Sections 13 and 33 recommended and approved.....	194
Deer or Moose—	
Not to be shot or pursued in the water by means of any conveyance.....	194
Deer, Open Season for—	
MR. E. L. HUGHES, <i>re</i>	172
Representations of County Councils <i>re</i> , left with Department.....	193
Special Game Committee makes recommendations <i>re</i> changes.....	193
Deer, Refuges for—	
MR. RUSSELL, Waubauskene, <i>re</i>	178
Deer, Use of Dogs in Hunting—	
MR. ELMER DAVIES in favour of.....	173
MR. BENNETT, Walkerville, supports MR. DAVIES.....	175
MR. CASTLE in favour of.....	175, 177
MR. GREGG in favour of.....	175
MR. W. D. COLBY in favour of.....	175
DR. C. B. TAYLOR, opposed.....	176
Middlesex Hunters' Game Protective Association endorses.....	176
MR. W. U. BATES, Matagama, opposed.....	177
MR. MOODY, Kitchener, favours.....	177
MR. NORVAL LYNN favours.....	178
Motion that existing regulations remain as they are.....	194
Deputy Game Wardens—	
<i>Re</i> retention of badge of office.....	172, 178
Dip Nets—	
MR. GRINER, Aldershot, <i>re</i> use of.....	186
MR. GREGG, Renfrew, <i>re</i> use of, in taking coarse fish.....	187
Does and Fawns—	
Motion carried <i>re</i> enactment of legislation prohibiting killing of.....	194
Dogs, Field Training in May, June, July, August—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> prohibition of, approved.....	194

Domestic Licenses—	PAGE
Recommendation <i>re</i> issuance to British subjects.....	189
Smith's Falls Fish and Game Protective Association, <i>re</i>	189
Dorion—	
Trout Rearing Station, establishment and opening of.....	167
Ducks, Feeding and Baiting—	
MR. W. D. COLBY, Kent Angling and Hunting Association, <i>re</i>	171
MR. OSLER, Toronto, <i>re</i>	171
MR. CALDER (Kent West) <i>re</i>	171
MR. CLARKSON (St. Anne's Club) <i>re</i>	190
Dufferin County Council—	
Representation <i>re</i> open season for deer.....	193
ECCLESTONE, MR.—	
Elected Chairman of the Committee.....	166
Elk—	
Established at Petewawa.....	166
To be established at Burwash.....	166
Close season recommended.....	191
ELLIOTT, MR. (Rainy River)—	
Presents resolution <i>re</i> closing certain lakes to commercial fishing.....	193
Essex County and Black Bass—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> investigation of conditions.....	188
FERRETS—	
Use of, in gun license area, discussed.....	170
Fishing Licenses for Nipigon waters.....	167
Fishing Regulations—	
MR. J. W. GRAVESTOCK, Peterborough, <i>re</i>	183
MR. F. J. A. BROWNE, Kirkland Lake, <i>re</i>	183
DR. A. B. JAMES <i>re</i>	186
MR. MOODY, Kitchener, <i>re</i>	187
Recommendations <i>re</i> amendment to.....	189
Freight, Shipments by—	
Amendment to Section 54 approved.....	192
Fur Dealers, Licensed—	
Recommendations in respect of.....	191
GAME AND FISHERIES, DEPARTMENT OF—	
HON. MR. CHALLIES on newspaper criticism of.....	180
Game Laws and Fishery Regulations—	
MR. MOODY, Kitchener, <i>re</i> printing of, as separate pamphlets.....	187
Game Preserve, Crown—	
MR. MOODY, Kitchener, advocates establishment of.....	177

Georgian Bay Waters—	PAGE
Ontario Federation of Anglers' recommendation <i>re</i>	189
GRAVESTOCK, J. W., Peterborough—	
<i>Re</i> fishing regulations.....	183
<i>Re</i> open season for pickerel, etc.....	186
<i>Re</i> amendment to regulations <i>re</i> speckled trout.....	189
Grey County Council—	
Representation <i>re</i> open season for deer.....	193
GREGG, MR., Renfrew—	
Opposes resolution <i>re</i> hunting water-fowl.....	171
Favours use of dogs in hunting deer.....	175
<i>Re</i> use of dip net for taking coarse fish.....	187
GRINER, W. R., Aldershot—	
<i>Re</i> use of ferrets and sale of cottontail rabbits in gun license area.....	170
<i>Re</i> Hamilton Bay as duck-shooting grounds open to public.....	172
<i>Re</i> use of dip nets.....	186
Guides—	
Recommendation of Special Game Committee approved.....	191
Guides' Licenses—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> issuance of licenses to British subjects.....	188
Gun License—	
Resolution <i>re</i> , by Ontario Hunters' Association.....	170
MR. HUNSBERY, Past President, Ontario Hunters' Game Protective Association <i>re</i> ..	170
Recommend Province-wide license.....	191
 HAMILTON BAY—	
MR. GRINER, Aldershot, <i>re</i> , as duck-shooting grounds.....	172
HANSEN, DR., Niagara Falls—	
<i>Re</i> trespassing on farmers' lands.....	172
HARRIS, MR. SAM, Toronto—	
<i>Re</i> conservation of game.....	176
HART, MR.—	
<i>Re</i> rod license.....	187
Hastings and Peterborough Counties—	
Additional waters included in regulations.....	189
HUGHES, MR. E. J., Trout Mills—	
<i>Re</i> resolution respecting hunting water-fowl.....	171
<i>Re</i> Section 7 (a) of the Game Laws.....	172
Expresses appreciation of action of Fish and Game Committee.....	178
<i>Re</i> Angling License.....	185
HUNSBERY, MR., Past President, Ontario Hunters' Game Protective Association—	
<i>Re</i> Gun Licenses.....	170
<i>Re</i> close season for rabbits in certain counties.....	172
<i>Re</i> attention of Committee for attendance and hearing representations of sportsmen..	178

JAMES, DR. A. B., President, Ontario Federation of Anglers—	PAGE
Submits summary of recommendations.....	181
<i>Re</i> Fishing Regulations.....	186
<i>Re</i> season for speckled trout.....	187
 KENT COUNTY AND BLACK BASS—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> investigating conditions.....	188
 LICENSE TO BRITISH SUBJECTS—	
<i>See</i> British	
Licensee—	
To make a return of his take, discussed.....	169
Longue Sault Fish and Game Association—	
<i>Re</i> spearing and gaffing sturgeon.....	189
LYNN, MR. NORVAL, Secretary, Welland Branch, Ontario Hunters' Association—	
<i>Re</i> use of dogs in hunting deer.....	178
<i>Re</i> Deputy Game Wardens retaining badge of office.....	178
 MASKINONGE, OPEN SEASON—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> Ottawa River.....	188
Meetings—	
February 28th, 10.00 a.m.....	166
March 15th, 10.00 a.m.....	168
March 16th, 10.00 a.m.....	179
March 21st, 10.00 a.m.....	188
March 24th, 10.00 a.m.....	190
March 29th, 10.00 a.m.....	193
Metallic Bands—	
To be attached to wild ducks, quail and ring-necked pheasants raised in captivity...	192
MICHELL, LIEUTENANT-COLONEL WM. C., Past President, Toronto Anglers' Association—	
On conservation and educational methods <i>re</i>	184
Middlesex Game Hunters' Protective Association—	
Endorses use of dogs in hunting deer.....	176
Migratory Birds—	
MR. I. J. RUSSELL, Waubaushene, <i>re</i> open season.....	171
Mink—	
Prohibit use of dogs in taking.....	191
MOODY, MR., Past President, Ontario Hunters' Association—	
<i>Re</i> Wolf Bounty.....	170
<i>Re</i> hunting water-fowl.....	171
<i>Re</i> establishment of Crown Game Preserve.....	177
<i>Re</i> use of dogs in hunting deer.....	177
<i>Re</i> rod license.....	183
Mourning Doves—	
To be protected.....	191

McKAY, MR., Departmental Biologist—	PAGE
<i>Re</i> Spawning of speckled trout.....	185
McLEAN, MR.—	
Elected Vice-Chairman of the Committee.....	166
<i>Re</i> Wolf Bounty.....	170
Welcomes Anglers' Associations and Fishing Clubs	179
 NETS FOR USE IN INLAND WATERS—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> issuance of license to British subjects or bona fide settlers.....	189
“Non-resident”—	
Definition of term amended.....	188
Northumberland County Council—	
Representation <i>re</i> open season for deer.....	193
 ONTARIO FEDERATION OF ANGLERS—	
Recommendations by, <i>re</i> certain Georgian Bay waters.....	189
OSLER, MR., Toronto—	
<i>Re</i> baiting and feeding ducks.....	171
Letter from, <i>re</i> duck shooting, etc.....	190
Ottawa River Waters—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> open season for black bass and maskinonge in.....	188
 PARTRIDGE—	
MR. CASTLE <i>re</i> open season for.....	178
Recommendation <i>re</i> future seasons left with Department.....	191
Pelee Island and Black Bass—	
Investigation <i>re</i> conditions recommended.....	188
Peterborough Fish and Game Protective Association—	
<i>Re</i> prohibition of “snagging” in game-fish waters.....	188
Peterborough and Hastings Counties—	
Additional waters included in regulations.....	189
Pheasants—	
HON. MR. CHALLIES <i>re</i> open season for.....	167
Recommendation <i>re</i> future season for, left with Department.....	191
Recommendation <i>re</i> breeding ring-necked pheasants in captivity.....	192
Prince Edward County—	
Representation <i>re</i> open season for deer.....	193
 QUAIL—	
Recommended <i>re</i> breeding in captivity.....	192
Quetico Park—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> game and fish resources in.....	192

	PAGE
RABBITS, cottontail, sale of, discussed.....	170
Rabbits, Close Season on, in Certain Counties—	
MR. HUNSBERRY <i>re</i>	172
Raccoon—	
Recommendations <i>re</i>	192
ROBINSON, MR., Middlesex Hunters' Game Protective Association—	
Adopts Ontario Hunters' Association resolutions.....	169
On Education in Schools <i>re</i> Conservation of Wild Life.....	169
Rod License—	
MR. MOODY, Kitchener, <i>re</i>	183
MR. JOS. SHEEDY <i>re</i>	184
MR. E. L. HUGHES <i>re</i>	185
MR. COLBY <i>re</i>	186
MR. F. J. A. BROWNE <i>re</i>	186
Rondeau Harbour—	
Feeding and baiting ducks at, discussed.....	171
Rondeau Park—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> game and fish resources in.....	192
RUSSELL, MR. I. J., Waubaushene—	
<i>Re</i> open season for migratory birds.....	171
<i>Re</i> establishment of refuges for deer.....	178
SIMCOE, COUNTY OF—	
Representation <i>re</i> open season for deer.....	193
SHEEDY, MR. JOS., Past President, Ontario Federation of Anglers—	
<i>Re</i> rod license.....	184
<i>Re</i> conservation.....	184
Smith's Falls Fish and Game Protective Association—	
<i>Re</i> domestic licenses.....	189
Snagging—	
Peterborough Fish and Game Protective Association <i>re</i> prohibition of.....	188
Special Game Committee Report—	
Presentation of, referred to.....	166, 168, 169
Speckled Trout—	
MR. MCKAY, Departmental Biologist, <i>re</i> spawning.....	185
DR. A. B. JAMES, <i>re</i> open season for.....	187
MR. GRAVESTOCK, <i>re</i> regulations.....	189
SPENCE, MR., Fort William—	
<i>Re</i> resolutions from Thunder Bay Protective Association.....	172
Moves vote of thanks to Ontario Hunters' Association and other organizations.....	178
Squirrel, Black and Grey—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> , left with Department.....	192
Sturgeon—	
Longue Sault Fish and Game Association <i>re</i> spearing and gaffing.....	189

TAYLOR, DR. C. B., St. Thomas—	PAGE
On privileges at Rondeau Harbour.....	172
Opposed to use of dogs in hunting deer.....	176
Thunder Bay Protective Association—	
MR. SPENCE, Fort William, tables resolution by.....	172
Trapping Licenses—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> issuance of, to British subjects.....	192
Trapping Lines, Restricted—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> , left with Department.....	192
Trapping Season—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> traps, deadfalls and snares.....	192
Recommendation <i>re</i> placing of traps before open season.....	192
Trespassing on Farmers' Lands—	
DR. HANSEN, Niagara Falls, <i>re</i> linen notices.....	172
HON. MR. CHALLIES <i>re</i> Section 61 of the Game Laws, Criminal Code, The Petty Trespass Act.....	172
Trout Rearing Station at Dorion—	
Referred to by HON. MR. CHALLIES.....	167
 WATER-FOWL, <i>re</i> Hunting—	
MR. E. J. HUGHES, Trout Mills, on resolution.....	171
MR. CASTLE supports resolution <i>re</i>	171
MR. MOODY opposes resolution.....	171
MR. GREGG, Renfrew, opposes resolution.....	171
Whitefish Bay, Lake-of-the-Woods—	
Recommendation <i>re</i> , left with Department.....	189
Wild Ducks—	
<i>Re</i> breeding in captivity.....	192
WILSON, MR. JAMES—	
<i>Re</i> establishment of buck law.....	176
Wolf Bounty—	
MR. MCLEAN <i>re</i>	170
MR. MOODY, Past President, Ontario Hunters' Association, <i>re</i>	170
Recommendation to leave as it is, etc.....	192
Wolf Menace—	
MR. ELMER DAVIES, Kingston, discusses.....	174
 ZONING IN CLOSE SEASONS—	
MR. CARSCALLEN, North Kent Hunting and Fishing Club, <i>re</i>	185



3 1761 1146371 9